LIFE OF JESUS

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/lifeofjesus0000erne_i5q1

LIFE OF JESUS

BY

ERNEST RENAN

Translation Revised from
the Twenty-Third French Edition

BOSTON
LITTLE, BROWN, AND COMPANY
1924

Copyright, 1895,
By Roberts Brothers.

Copyright, 1923,
By Little, Brown, and Company.

All rights reserved

Printed in the United States of America

To the Pure Soul

OF

MY SISTER HENRIETTA,

WHO DIED AT BYBLOS, SEPT. 24, 1861.

✠

FROM the bosom of God, in which thou reposest, dost thou recall those long days at Ghazir, when, alone with thee, I wrote these pages, inspired by the places we had visited together? Silent at my side, thou didst read each sheet, and copy it as soon as written; while the sea, the villages, the ravines, the mountains, were spread out at our feet. When the overpowering light had given place to the innumerable host of stars, thy delicate and subtile questions, thy cautious doubts, brought me back to the sublime object of our common thoughts. Thou saidst to me one day that this book would be dear to thee, because it had been written with thy aid, and because, also, it was after thine own heart. If at times thou didst fear for it the narrow judgment of frivolous men, thou wast ever persuaded that truly religious souls would, in the end, take delight in it. In the midst of these sweet meditations, Death struck us both with his wing; the sleep of fever overtook us at the same hour: I awoke alone! Thou sleepest now in the land of Adonis, near the holy Byblos and the sacred waters where the women of the ancient mysteries came to mingle their tears. Reveal to me, O good genius, — to me whom thou lovedst, — those truths which conquer death, deprive it of fear, and make it almost beloved.

EDITOR'S NOTE.

In this revised version of what is widely recognised as the one great literary monument of a century of New Testament criticism, the two best known English translations have been freely used, while nearly every sentence has been recast, and the whole has been scrupulously weighed, phrase by phrase, with the original. The Scripture references have been made more precise, and some of them corrected; attention has been called to several points of recent criticism which appear to qualify the author's judgment; and additions (generally indicated by brackets) have been made here and there, in footnotes, as seemed to be required. Circumstances beyond the Editor's control have made it impossible to do more than verify in the most general way Renan's very numerous references to the remoter, especially the later Hebrew, sources; but it is hoped that the student will find the essential aid he may require in the few additions which have been supplied, while the Index now added will sufficiently serve the needs of the general reader.

A few biographical data are here appended, taken chiefly from the "Life of Renan" by Francis Espinasse:[1] —

Joseph Ernest Renan was born February 28, 1823, at Tréquier, a coast town of Celtic Brittany, and died in Paris, October 2, 1892. His early education was intended to fit him for the priesthood; but he abandoned this vocation at

[1] Published by Walter Scott, London, 1895.

the age of twenty-two, devoting himself to a lifework of erudition and letters. A stay in the East in 1860–61, as director of a Commission for the exploration of ancient Phœnicia, gave him the desired opportunity of composing the first draft of his "Life of Jesus" under fresh impressions of the climate and soil of Palestine;[1] and a second visit, in 1864, deepened that colouring of Oriental life which so strongly marks his historical expositions. The first edition of this work was published in 1863; the fifteenth, thoroughly revised, — with sundry changes in its critical view, expressed in the elaborate Preface and Appendix of the present volume, — appeared in 1876 as Volume I. in the series of the *Origines du Christianisme*, which was completed in 1881 by Volume VII., on the reign of Marcus Aurelius. The "Life of Jesus" is, accordingly, at once the crowning volume of the "History of Israel" (five volumes, 1887–1894), and the opening one of the *Origines*, making the keystone of the large historical construction to which Renan devoted the chief labour of his life. Its success was "immediate and immense." Eleven editions, published within six months, brought its circulation to 66,000 copies; while "there were already two German and two Dutch translations of it, with one Italian," and an English translation (London: Trübner & Co.) appeared in the course of the year.

The extraordinary impression made by this work upon the religious world, and the numerous replies which it called forth, most of them hostile, are a notable part of the literary history of our time. To the charge of an irreligious motive or tendency, Renan made the following reply in his Introduction to the second volume of the *Origines*, that entitled "The Apostles": —

[1] See page 72 of the present volume.

"Let us enjoy our freedom [of thought] as sons of God, but let us have no hand in that weakening of virtue which would menace society itself if Christianity should be undermined. Where should we be without it? Who would make good the lack of those great schools of sobriety and reverence, such as St. Sulpice, or of that devoted service of the Daughters of Charity? How can we view without alarm the poverty of heart and the meanness of motive which even now invade the world? Our dissent from those who uphold the dogmatic faith is, after all, a mere difference of opinion: at heart we are their allies. We have but one enemy, who is also theirs, — a vulgar materialism, and the baseness of him who serves himself alone."

Of the author of this volume the historian Mommsen pronounced that he was a true scholar, " in spite of the beauty of his style;" and of his personal character — including the qualities of tenderness, devoutness, and ardent love of truth — it was said by an English friend that, though on some points " an agnostic, whose opinions may have been as detestable as pos sible," he was yet " a saint, even if judged by the teachings of the Galilean Lake." On the other hand, a French critic has strikingly shown the results of his indeterminate method of thought, with the relaxed ethical tone it entailed, — " his philosophy without logic, his morality without rules of life, his religion without dogma or symbol," — as shown in his later writings, especially after the violent disillusion of the Franco-German war.[1]

JOSEPH HENRY ALLEN.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,
December, 1895.

[1] Gabriel Séailles: *Ernest Renan, Essai de Biographie Psychologique* (Paris: Perrin et Cie., 1895), pp. 258–276, 322–332.

CONTENTS.

		Page
PREFACE to the Thirteenth Edition		11
INTRODUCTION: the Original Documents		37
Chapter		
I.	Place in History	77
II.	Childhood	91
III.	Early Education	99
IV.	Mental Development	109
V.	Earlier Teachings	129
VI.	John the Baptist	146
VII.	The Kingdom of God	160
VIII.	At Capernaum	172
IX.	The Disciples	186
X.	Preachings on the Lakeside	198
XI.	The Kingdom of the Poor	208
XII.	John in Prison	220
XIII.	In Jerusalem	228
XIV.	Samaritans and Pagans	243
XV.	The Messiah of Prophecy and Legend	252
XVI.	Miracles	267
XVII.	Conceptions of the Divine Kingdom	279
XVIII.	What Jesus founded	294
XIX.	Deepening Glow and Stress	307
XX.	Opposition to Jesus	317

Chapter		Page
XXI.	Last Journey to Jerusalem	328
XXII.	Hostile Machinations	343
XXIII.	The Last Week	353
XXIV.	Arrest and Trial	369
XXV.	The Crucifixion	386
XXVI.	The Sepulchre	397
XXVII.	Fate of his Enemies	403
XXVIII.	The Work of Jesus	408

APPENDIX: Historic Value of the Fourth Gospel . . 423

INDEX 479

PREFACE

TO THE THIRTEENTH EDITION.

The twelve earlier editions of this work differ from one another only in trifling changes. The present edition, on the contrary, has been revised and corrected with the greatest care. During the four years since the book appeared, I have laboured incessantly to improve it. The numerous criticisms to which it has given rise have rendered the task in certain respects an easy one. I have read all those which contain anything important. I believe I can conscientiously affirm that not once have the outrage and the calumny which have been imported into them hindered me from deriving profit from the just observations which those criticisms might contain. I have weighed everything, tested everything. If in certain cases people should wonder why I have not answered fully the censures which have been made with such extreme assurance, and as if the errors alleged had been proved, it is not that I did not know of these censures, but that it was impossible for me to accept them. In such cases I have generally added in a note the texts or the considerations which have kept me from changing my opinion, or else by some slight change of expression I have endeavoured to show wherein lay the error of my critics. These notes, though very brief and doing little more than point out the original sources, are still enough to show the intelligent reader the reasonings that have guided me in the composition of my text.

To answer in detail all the charges that have been brought against me, it would have been necessary for me to triple or quadruple this volume. I should have had to repeat things

which have already been well said, even in French. I must have gone into religious controversy, — a thing that I absolutely forbid myself to do. I should have had to speak of myself, a thing I never do. I write in order to put my ideas before those who seek the truth. As for those persons who in the interest of their belief must have it that I am an ignoramus, a lying spirit, or a man of bad faith, I make no attempt to modify their opinion. If that opinion is necessary for the peace of mind of certain pious people, I should feel a genuine scruple at disabusing them.

The controversy, moreover, if I had entered upon it, must have led me very often to points quite outside historical criticism. The objections made against me have come from two opposing parties. One set has been addressed to me by freethinkers, who do not believe in the supernatural,[1] nor, consequently, in the inspiration of the sacred books; or else by theologians of the liberal Protestant school, who have come to take such broad doctrinal views that the rationalist can readily arrive at an understanding with them. These adversaries and I find ourselves on common ground; we start with the same principles; we can discuss according to the rules followed in all questions of history, philology, and archæology. As to the refutations of my book (and these are much the most numerous) which have been made by orthodox theologians, both Catholic and Protestant, who believe in the supernatural and in the sacred character of the books of the Old and New Testaments, they all involve a fundamental misapprehension. If the miracle has any reality, this book is but a tissue of errors. If the Gospels are inspired books, and true consequently to the letter, from beginning to end, I have been wholly in the wrong in not contenting myself with piecing together the broken fragments of the four texts, as the Harmonists do, sure of constructing thus an *ensemble* at once most redundant

[1] By this word I always mean the *special* supernatural act, miracle, or the divine intervention for a particular end; not the general supernatural force, the hidden Soul of the Universe, the ideal, source, and final cause of all movements in the system of things.

and most contradictory. If, on the contrary, miracle is a thing inadmissible, then I am right in regarding the books which contain miraculous tales as history mixed with fiction, as legends full of inaccuracies, errors, and systematic shifts. If the Gospels are like other books, I am right in treating them in the same manner as the student of Greek, Arabian, or Hindoo lore treats the legendary documents which he studies. Criticism knows no infallible texts; its first principle is to admit the possibility of error in the text which it examines. Far from being accused of scepticism, I ought to be classed with the moderate critics, since, instead of rejecting in the lump documents damaged by so much alloy, I try to get something historical out of them by cautious modifications of the story.

And let no one assert that to put the question in such a manner implies that we take for granted beforehand what is to be proved in detail, — namely, that the miracles related by the Gospels had no reality; that the Gospels are not books written by help of the Divinity. Those two negations do not with us result from our method of criticism; they are anterior to it. They are the outcome of an experience which has never been belied. Miracles are things which never happen. Only credulous people think they see them: you cannot cite a single one which has taken place in presence of witnesses competent to give a clear account of it. No special intervention of the Divinity, whether in the composition of a book, or in any event whatever, has been proved. In the very fact that one admits the supernatural, he is so far outside the province of science; he accepts an explanation which is non-scientific, an explanation which is set aside by the astronomer, the physicist, the chemist, the geologist, the physiologist, — one which the historian also must set aside. We reject the supernatural for the same reason that we reject the existence of centaurs and hippogriffs; and this reason is, that nobody has ever seen them. It is not because it has been proved to me beforehand that the evangelists do not merit absolute credence, that I reject the miracles which they relate. It is because they tell of miracles

that I say, "The Gospels are legends; they may contain history, but certainly all that they set forth is not historical."

It is hence impossible that the orthodox believer and the rationalist, who denies the supernatural, can help each other much in such discussions. In the eyes of theologians, the Gospels and the contents of the Bible in general are books like no others, — books more historic than the best of histories, inasmuch as they contain no error. To the rationalist, on the contrary, the Gospels are texts to which his very business is to apply the ordinary rules of criticism. We are in this respect like Arabic scholars in presence of the Koran and the *hadith;* like Hindoo students in presence of the Vedas and the Buddhist books. Do our Arabic scholars regard the Koran as infallible? Do we accuse them of falsifying history when they relate the origins of Islamism differently from the Mussulman theologians? Do our Orientalists hold the legendary life of Buddha [*Lalitavistara*] to be an authentic biography?

How can we come to an understanding when we set out from opposite principles? All rules of criticism assume that a document subjected to examination has but a relative value; that it may be in error, and corrected by some better document. A classical scholar, persuaded that all books bequeathed to us from the past are the work of men, does not hesitate to challenge the texts when they contradict one another; when they set forth absurd statements, or those formally disproved by documents of greater authority. The orthodox believer, on the contrary, sure in advance that his sacred books do not contain an error or a contradiction, is party to the most violent tactics, to expedients the most desperate, to get out of difficulties. Orthodox exegesis is, in this way, a tissue of subtilties. A single forced interpretation may be true; but a thousand such subtilties at once cannot be true. If there were in Tacitus or Polybius errors so pronounced as those committed by Luke regarding Quirinius and Theudas, we should say that Tacitus and Polybius were wrong. Reasonings which we would not allow if the question were one of Greek or Latin literature — hypotheses which a Boissonade, or even a Rollin,

would never think of — are held to be plausible when one sets himself to defend a sacred writer.

Hence it is the orthodox apologist that is guilty of bad logic when he reproaches the rationalist with falsifying history, because he does not accept word for word the documents which orthodoxy holds to be sacred. Because a fact is written down, it does not follow that it is true. The miracles of Mahomet are down in writing, as well as those of Jesus; and certainly the Arabian biographies of Mahomet — that of Ibn-Hashim, for example — have a much more historical character than the Gospels. Do we on this account admit the miracles of Mahomet? We follow Ibn-Hashim, with more or less confidence, when we have no reasons to differ from him. But when he relates to us things perfectly incredible, we make no difficulty about abandoning him. Certainly, if we had four lives of Buddha, partly fabulous, and as irreconcilable with one another as the four Gospels, and if a scholar essayed to relieve the four Buddhist narratives of their contradictions, we should not accuse that scholar of charging the texts with falsehood. It might be well should he attempt to reconcile discordant passages, or seek a compromise, a sort of neutral tale, a narrative to contain nothing impossible, in which opposing testimony should be balanced and treated with as little violence as possible. If, after that, the Buddhists believed in a lie, in the falsification of history, we should have a right to say to them: "The question here is not one of history; and if we must at times discard your texts, it is the fault of those texts which contain things impossible of belief, and which, moreover, contradict one another."

At the bottom of all discussion on such matters is the question of the supernatural. If miracle and the inspiration of certain books are actual facts, our method is false and wrong. If miracle and the inspiration of such books are beliefs without reality, our method is the right one. Now, the question of the supernatural is settled for us with absolute certainty by this simple reason, that there is no room for belief in a thing of which the world can offer no experimental test. We

do not believe in a miracle, just as we do not believe in ghosts, in the devil, in sorcery, or in astrology. Have we any need to refute step by step the long reasonings of astrology in order to deny that the stars influence human events? No. For this the purely negative evidence is enough — quite as convincing as the best direct proof — that such an influence has never been established.

God forbid that we should be unmindful of the services which theologians have rendered to science! Investigation and verification of the texts which serve as authorities for this history have often been the work of orthodox theologians. The labour of criticism has been the task of liberal theologians. But there is one thing that a theologian can never be, — I mean, an historian. History is essentially disinterested. The historian has but one care, — art and truth. These two are inseparable: art guards the secret of the laws most closely related to truth. The theologian has an interest, — his dogma. Minimise that dogma as much as you will; it is still, to the artist and the critic, an insupportable burden. The orthodox theologian may be compared to a caged bird: every movement natural to it is forbidden. The liberal theologian is a bird, some of whose wing-feathers have been clipped. You think him master of himself; and in fact he is so until the moment he seeks to take his flight. Then it is seen that he is not completely the child of the air. Let us say it boldly: critical studies relating to the origin of Christianity will not have said their last word until they are cultivated in a purely secular and unprofessional spirit, after the method of Greek, Arabic, or Sanscrit scholars, — men strangers to all theology, who think neither of edifying nor of scandalising nor of defending nor of refuting dogmas.

Day and night, I presume to say, I have reflected on these questions, which ought to be discussed without any other prejudices than those that make the very essence of reason itself. The weightiest of all, unquestionably, is that of the historic value of the Fourth Gospel. Those who have never changed their view on such problems give room for the belief

that they have not comprehended the whole difficulty. We may range the opinions on this Gospel into four classes, of which the following is the abridged expression : —

First opinion : "The Fourth Gospel was written by the Apostle John, the son of Zebedee. The statements contained in that Gospel are all true; the discourses which the author puts into the mouth of Jesus were actually spoken by Jesus." This is the orthodox opinion. From the point of view of rational criticism, it is wholly untenable.

Second opinion : "The Fourth Gospel is in substance by the Apostle John, although it may have been revised and retouched by his disciples. The facts related in this Gospel are direct traditions in regard to Jesus. The discourses are often free compositions, expressing only the manner in which the author conceived the mind of Jesus." This is the opinion of Ewald, and in some respects that of Lücke, Weisse, and Reuss. It is the opinion which I adopted in the first edition of this work.

Third opinion : "The Fourth Gospel is not the work of the Apostle John. It was attributed to him by some disciple of his about the year 100. The discourses are almost entirely fictitious; but the narrative parts contain valuable traditions, ascending in part to the Apostle John." This is the opinion of Weizsäcker and of Michael Nicolas. It is the opinion which I now hold.

Fourth opinion : "The Fourth Gospel is in no sense the work of the Apostle John. Neither the facts nor the discourses reported in it are historical. It is a work of the imagination, and in part allegorical, which came to birth about the year 150; and the author's purpose in it is not to recount the actual life of Jesus, but to propagate the idea which he has himself formed of Jesus." Such is, with some variations, the opinion of Baur, Schwegler, Strauss, Zeller, Volkmar, Hilgenfeld, Schenkel, Scholten, and Réville.

I cannot quite fall in with this radical party. I am still convinced that the Fourth Gospel has a real connection with the Apostle John, and that it was written about the end of the

first century. I confess, however, that in certain passages of my first edition I leaned too much in the direction of authenticity. The convincing force of some arguments upon which I then insisted seems to me diminished. I no longer believe that Saint Justin put the Fourth Gospel on the same footing with the Synoptics among the "Memoirs of the Apostles." The existence of "John the Elder," a personage distinct from the Apostle John, appears to me now very problematical. The opinion that John, the son of Zebedee, wrote the work, — an hypothesis which I have never fully admitted, but for which, at moments, I felt a certain weakness, — is here discarded as improbable. Finally, I acknowledge that I was wrong in my hostility to the hypothesis of a spurious writing, ascribed to an apostle at the end of the apostolic age. The Second Epistle of Peter, the authenticity of which no one can reasonably maintain, is an example of a work, much less important no doubt than the Fourth Gospel, forged under such conditions. Moreover, this is not for the moment the capital question. The essential thing is to know what use it is fit to make of the Fourth Gospel when one essays to write the Life of Jesus. I persist in believing that this Gospel has a substantial value equal to that of the Synoptics, and even sometimes superior. The development of this point is of such importance that I have made it the topic of an appendix at the end of this volume. The portion of the introduction relating to the criticism of the Fourth Gospel has been revised and completed.

In the body of the narrative several passages have also been modified in consequence of what has just been said. All phrases more or less implying that the Fourth Gospel was by the Apostle John, or by an eye-witness of the evangelical facts, have been cut out. In order to trace the personal character of John, the son of Zebedee, I have thought of the rude "Boanerges" of Mark, the terrifying seer of the Apocalypse, — no longer of the mystic, full of tenderness, who has written the Gospel of Love. I insist, with less confidence, on certain little details furnished us by the Fourth Gospel. The few citations I had made from the discourses of that Gospel have

been still further reduced. I had allowed myself to follow too far in the steps of the alleged apostle in what concerned the promise of the "Comforter" (παράκλητος). In like manner, I am no longer so sure that the Fourth Gospel is right in its disagreement with the Synoptics as to the day on which Jesus died. Regarding the Lord's Supper, on the contrary, I persist in my opinion. The synoptic account, which places the eucharistic institution on the last evening of Jesus' life, appears to me to involve an improbability almost equal to a miracle. That is, as I think, a view purely conventional, resting on a certain misty halo of recollections.

The critical view as to the Synoptics has not been substantially altered. It has been filled out and defined on some points, notably in that portion which concerns Luke. As regards Lysanias, a study of the inscription of Zenodorus at Baalbec, which I made for the Phœnician Mission, has led me to believe that the evangelist may have been less seriously in error than some ingenious critics think. As to Quirinius, on the contrary, the last memoir of Mommsen has settled the question against the Third Gospel. Mark seems to me more and more the primitive type of the synoptic narrative, and the most authentic text.

The paragraph relating to the Apocryphal writings has been expanded. The important texts published by Ceriani have been put to service. I have had much hesitation about the Book of Enoch. I reject the opinion of Weisse, Volkmar, and Grätz, who believe that the whole book is posterior to Jesus. As to the most important portion of the book, which extends from chapter xxvii. to chapter lxxi., I do not venture to decide between the arguments of Hilgenfeld and Colani, who regard this portion as later than the time of Jesus, and the opinion of Hoffmann, Dillmann, Köstlin, Ewald, Lücke, and Weizsäcker, who hold it to be earlier. How much is it to be desired that the Greek text of that important writing could be found![1] I do not know why I persist in believing that

[1] In the final volume of his "History of the People of Israel" (vol. v. p. 20), Renan fully accepts the earlier date. — Tr.

this is not a vain hope. I have, in any case, expressed my doubt of the inductions drawn from the chapters just named. I have shown, on the contrary, the marked correspondence of the discourses of Jesus contained in the last chapters of the Synoptic Gospels with the Apocalypses attributed to Enoch. The discovery of the complete Greek text of the epistle ascribed to Barnabas has cast much light on these relations, which Weizsäcker has besides put in excellent relief. The certain results obtained by Volkmar in regard to the Fourth Book of Esdras, which agree in almost every particular with those of Ewald, have been equally taken into consideration. Several new citations have been introduced from the Talmud. The space allotted to Essenism has been enlarged.

The course I have taken in discarding bibliography has often been wrongly interpreted. I believe I have plainly enough declared what I owe to the masters of German learning in general, and to each of them in particular, to prevent my silence from being taxed with ingratitude. Bibliography is useful only when it is complete. Now, the German genius has displayed such activity in the field of evangelical criticism that if I had cited all the works bearing on the questions treated in this book, I should have tripled the bulk of the notes and changed the character of my work. One cannot do everything at once. I have therefore kept to the rule of only admitting citations at first hand. Their number has been greatly multiplied. Besides, for the convenience of French readers who are not conversant with these studies, I have continued to give a summary list of writings composed in our language, where they may find details which I have unavoidably omitted. Many of these works are far remote from my ideas; but all are of a nature to make an educated man reflect, and to give him a fair understanding of our discussions.

The fabric of the narrative has been little changed. Certain too strong expressions as to the communistic temper which was of the essence of Christianity at its birth have been softened down. Among those holding personal relations with Jesus

I have admitted some whose names do not figure in the Gospels, but who are known to us through trustworthy evidence. That which relates to the name of Peter has been modified. I have also adopted another hypothesis in regard to Levi, son of Alpheus, and his relations with the Apostle Matthew. As to Lazarus, I unhesitatingly adopt now the ingenious hypothesis of Strauss, Baur, Zeller, and Scholten, according to which the pious beggar of Luke's parable and the person restored to life by Jesus are one and the same. It will nevertheless be seen how I still make him a real person by identifying him with Simon the Leper. I adopt likewise the hypothesis of Strauss in respect of various discourses ascribed to Jesus during his last days, which appear to be quotations from writings current in the first century. The textual discussion as to the duration of the public life of Jesus has been brought to greater precision. The topography of Bethphage and Dalmanutha has been modified. The question as to Golgotha has been taken up anew, following the investigations of M. Vogüé. A person well versed in the history of botany has taught me to distinguish, in the orchards of Galilee, between trees which grew there eighteen hundred years ago and those which were not transplanted there till later. Some facts have also been communicated to me in regard to the potion administered to the crucified; and to these I have given a place. In general, in the account of the last hours of Jesus, I have toned down some phraseology which might have too much the look of history. It is here that Strauss's favorite explanations best meet the case, since here motives of symbol and dogma may be seen at every step.

I have said, and I repeat, that if in writing the Life of Jesus one should confine himself to setting forth those matters only which are certain, he must limit himself to a few lines. Jesus existed. He was from Nazareth in Galilee. There was charm in his preaching, and he left profound sayings deeply graven in the memory of his hearers. His two chief disciples were Cephas (Peter) and John the son of Zebedee. He excited the hatred of the orthodox Jews, who succeeded in having him

put to death by Pontius Pilate, then procurator of Judæa. He was crucified outside the gate of the city. It was shortly after believed that he had been restored to life. This is what we should know for certain, even if the Gospels did not exist or were false, through authentic texts of incontestable date, such as the evidently genuine epistles of Saint Paul, the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Apocalypse, and other texts accepted by all. Beyond that, it is permissible to doubt. What was his family? What in particular was his affinity to that James, "the Lord's brother," who after his death plays an important part? Had he actual relations with John the Baptist, and did the most celebrated of his disciples belong to the school of the Baptist before they belonged to his? What were his ideas of the messiahship? Did he regard himself as the Messiah? What were his apocalyptic ideas? Did he believe that he would appear as the Son of Man in the clouds? Did he imagine that he wrought miracles? Were any attributed to him during his life? Did his legend grow up round himself, and had he cognisance of it? What was his moral character? What were his ideas regarding the admission of Gentiles into the Kingdom of God? Was he a pure Jew, like James, or did he break with Judaism, as the most active party in his Church did afterward? In what order of growth was his thought subsequently wrought out? Those who seek only the indubitable in history must keep silent upon all that. In respect of these questions the Gospels are not much to be relied on, seeing that they often furnish arguments for two opposite opinions, the aspect of Jesus being modified in them according to the dogmatic view of the narrator. For my part I think that in such cases it is allowable to make conjectures, provided that they are presented as such. The texts, not being historic, give no certainty; but they give something. We should not follow them with blind confidence; we should not reject their testimony with unjust disdain. We must strive to divine what they conceal, without being ever quite certain of having found it.

It is singular that on almost all these points it is the liberal

school of theology that offers the most sceptical solutions. The more sensible defenders of Christianity have come to consider it advantageous to leave a gap in the historical circumstances bearing upon the birth of Christianity. Miracles and messianic prophecies, formerly the bases of the Christian apology, have come to be its embarrassment: the aim now is to put them aside. If we hearken to the partisans of this theology, among whom I could cite many eminent critics and noble thinkers, Jesus never pretended to perform a miracle; he did not believe himself to be the Messiah; he had no thought of the apocalyptic discourses which have been imputed to him touching the final catastrophe. That Papias, so clinging to tradition, so zealous to gather up the words of Jesus, was an enthusiastic millenarian; that Mark, the oldest and most authentic of the Gospel writers, is almost exclusively taken up with miracles, — matters little. The part assigned to Jesus is in this way so dwarfed that we should find it hard to tell what it was. His condemnation to death can on such an hypothesis no more be accounted for than the fortune which made him the chief of a messianic and an apocalyptic movement. Was it on account of his moral precepts or the Sermon on the Mount that Jesus was crucified? Certainly not. These maxims had for a long time been the current coin of the synagogues. No one has ever been put to death for repeating them. If Jesus was put to death at all, it was for saying something more than that. A learned man, who has taken part in these discussions, wrote me lately: "As in former times it was necessary to prove at all hazards that Jesus was God, so the Protestant theologians of our day must needs prove, not only that he was a mere man, but also that he always regarded himself as such. People persist in representing him as a man of clear intelligence, as the especially practical man; they transform him into the image and according to the spirit of modern theology. I believe with you that this is not doing justice to historical truth, but is neglecting an essential side of it."

This tendency has already been more than once logically

developed in the bosom of Christianity. What did Marcion aim at? What did the Gnostics of the second century seek to do? Simply, to discard the material circumstances of a biography whose human details shocked them. Baur and Strauss yielded to the like philosophical necessities. The divine Æon self-developed in a human life has nothing to do with anecdotic incidents, with the particular life of an individual. Scholten and Schenkel hold certainly to an historic and actual Jesus; but their historic Jesus is neither a messiah nor a prophet nor a Jew. One does not know what he aimed at, nor comprehend either his life or his death. Their Jesus is an æon after his own manner, a being impalpable, intangible. Pure history is not acquainted with any such beings. Pure history must construct its edifice out of two kinds of materials, — so to speak, out of two factors: first, the general state of the human mind in a given age and country; second, the particular incidents which, combining with general causes, determined the course of events. To explain history by incidental facts is as false as to explain it by principles purely philosophic. The two explanations ought mutually to sustain and complete each other. The history of Jesus and of the apostles must, before all, be a history constructed out of a vast mixture of ideas and sentiments. Nor would even that be sufficient. A thousand chances, a thousand whims, a thousand trifles, are mingled in the ideas and sentiments. To trace at this day the exact details of these chances, whims, and trifles is impossible; what legend tells us of them may be true, but it may also not be true. In my opinion, the best course to hold is to keep as close as we can to the original narratives, while we discard impossibilities, put an interrogation-mark at every point, and offer as conjectures the various ways in which the event may have taken place. I am not quite sure that the conversion of Paul came about as we have it related in the Acts; but it took place in a manner not widely different from that, for Paul himself tells us that he had a vision of the risen Jesus, which gave an entirely new direction to his life. I am not sure whether the narrative of the Acts as to the descent

of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost is quite historic; but the ideas which went abroad as to the baptism of fire lead me to believe that a scene took place in the apostolic circle in which thunder played a part, as at Sinai. The visions of the risen Jesus were in like manner occasioned by chance circumstances, interpreted by vivid and already preoccupied imaginations.

If liberal theologians repudiate explanations of this kind, it is because they do not wish to bring Christianity under the laws common to other religious movements; because also, perhaps, they do not sufficiently understand the theory of spiritual life. There is no religious movement in which such deceptions do not play a great part. It may even be said that they make the standing condition of certain communities, such as the Protestant pietists, the Mormons, and Catholic convents. In these little excited worlds it is not rare that conversions are the result of some incident in which the stricken soul sees the finger of God. These incidents, which always have in them something puerile, are kept hid by the believers; it is a secret between Heaven and them. Chance is nothing to a cold or indifferent soul; to a soul possessed, it is a sign from God. To say that it was an outward incident which changed Paul or Ignatius Loyola through and through, or rather which gave a new turn to their activity, is certainly inexact. It is the interior movement of these strong natures that prepares a way for the thunderclap, yet the thunderclap itself was determined by an exterior cause. All these phenomena, moreover, have to do with a moral condition which is no longer our own. In a multitude of their acts the ancients were governed by dreams they had had the night before, by inferences drawn from the object that happened first to strike their sight, or by sounds which they believed they heard. The flight of birds, currents of the air, slight nervous attacks, have determined the fate of the world. This we must say, that our judgment may be honest and impartial; and when documents fairly accurate tell us stories of this kind, we must beware how we pass them over in silence. In history there are but

few details which are certain; details, nevertheless, possess always some significance. The historian's talent consists in making a true picture out of features that are of themselves but half true.

Thus we can yield a place in history to particular incidents, without being on that account a rationalist of the old school, a disciple of Paulus. Paulus was a theologian who, wishing to have as little miracle as possible, and not daring to treat the Bible narratives as legends, put them to the rack so as to explain them all in a purely natural way. Paulus claimed, along with this, to retain for the Bible all its authority, and to enter into the real thought of the sacred writers.[1] But I am a profane critic. I believe that no supernatural story is true to the letter; I think that out of a hundred tales of the supernatural eighty are born full-grown from popular imagination. Still, I admit that in certain very rare cases legend comes from an actual fact transformed by the imagination. As to the mass of supernatural incidents recounted by the Gospels and by the Acts, I shall attempt to show in five or six how the illusion may have been created. The theologian, invariably methodical, insists that a single explanation should hold good from one end of the Bible to the other. The critic believes that every explanation should be attempted, or rather that the possibility of each should be shown in its turn. What an explanation may contain repugnant to our taste is no reason for rejecting it. The world is a stage-play at once infernal and divine, — a strange symphony conducted by a leader of genius, in which good and ill, the ugly and the beautiful, march in the ranks assigned them, so as to fulfil a mysterious end.

[1] Here was the weakness of Paulus. If he had been content to say that many stories of miracle have a foundation of natural events misunderstood, he would have been right. But it was childish of him to insist that the sacred writer only meant to relate quite simple things, and that it was doing a good turn for the Bible text to rid it of its miracles. The lay critic can and should make such hypotheses, called "rationalist;" but the theologian has no such right, for their condition antecedent is to assume that the text is not revealed.

History is not history if in reading it one is not by turns charmed and disgusted, saddened and consoled.

The first task of the historian is to sketch well the environment in which the events he recounts took place. Now, the history of religious beginnings transports us into a world of women and children, of heads hot or dizzied. These facts, placed before minds of a positive order, are absurd and unintelligible: this is why countries such as England, ponderously rational, find it impossible to comprehend anything about them. The thing that lacks in the arguments, once so famous, of Sherlock or Gilbert West upon the resurrection, of Lyttelton upon the conversion of Saint Paul, is not the reasoning process, — that is a triumph of solidity; it is the just appreciation of the difference in environment. Every religious effort we are clearly acquainted with exhibits a prodigious mixture of the sublime and the ridiculous. Read those narratives of primitive Saint Simonism, written with admirable candour by the surviving adepts.[1] By the side of repulsive exhibitions, tasteless declamations, what charm, what sincerity, when the man or the woman of the people enters upon the scene, bearing the artless confession of a soul which opens to the first gentle ray that has struck it! There is more than one example of beautiful, durable things which have been founded upon strange puerilities. It were needless to seek for any proportion between the conflagration and the spark that lights it. The devotion of Salette is one of the great religious events of our age.[2] These cathedrals, so noble, of Chartres or Laon, were reared upon illusions of the same sort. The festival of Corpus Christi (*Fête-Dieu*) originated in the visions of a female religionist of Liège, who always believed that in her prayers she saw the full moon with a small cleft.[3] We could instance move-

[1] *Œuvres de Saint-Simon et d'Enfantin.* Paris, Dentu, 1865–66.

[2] That of Lourdes seems to be taking equal proportions.

[3] A nun of Liège, named Juliana, who in 1230, while looking at the full moon, "said she saw a gap in its orb, and by a revelation from Heaven learned that the moon represented the Christian Church, and the gap the want of a certain festival — that of the adoration of the body of Christ in the consecrated host — which she was to begin to celebrate, and to announce to the world." — Tr.

ments, absolutely sincere, which have sprung up about impostors. The discovery of the holy lance at Antioch, in which the fraud was so patent, decided the fortune of the Crusades. Mormonism, which in its origin was so discreditable, has inspired courage and devotion. The religion of the Druses rests upon a tissue of absurdities that stagger the imagination; but it has its devotees. Islamism, which is the second great event in the history of the world, would not now exist if the son of Amina had not been an epileptic. The gentle and immaculate Francis of Assisi would not have succeeded without Brother Elias. Humanity is so feeble of mind that the purest thing needs the co-operation of some impure agent.

Let us guard against applying our scrupulous distinctions, our reasonings of cool and clear heads, to the appreciation of these extraordinary events, which are at once so much above and beneath us. One would make Jesus a sage, one a philosopher, one a patriot, one a good man, one a moralist, one a saint. He was not any one of these. He was a charmer. Let us not make the past in our own image. Let us not believe that Asia is Europe. With us, for example, the madman is a creature outside the common rule; we torture him so as to make him re-enter it: the horrible methods of the old mad-houses were the result of scholastic and Cartesian logic. In the East, the lunatic is a privileged being; he enters the highest councils without any one daring to stop him; he is listened to, he is consulted. He is a being believed to be nearer to God, inasmuch as, his individual reason being extinguished, he is believed to be a partaker in the divine reason. The wit which, through delicate raillery, rises above all defects of reason, has no existence in Asia. A person of high rank of Islam told me that, repairs having become necessary a few years ago at the tomb of Mahomet at Medina, an appeal was made to the masons, with the warning that he who should descend into that formidable place should have his head cut off on reascending. A man offered himself, went down, made the repairs, then submitted to be beheaded. "It could not be helped," said my interlocutor to me; "we picture those places to our-

selves in a certain manner, and there must not be any one who can say that they are otherwise."

Troubled consciences cannot have the clearness of good sense. Now, it is only troubled consciences that lay foundations with power. I have tried to draw a picture in which the colours should be blended as they are in nature, which should be a likeness of humanity, — that is to say, at once grand and puerile, in which one should see the divine instinct threading its way with safety through a thousand peculiarities. If the picture had been without shadow, this would have been the proof that it was false. The condition of the written proofs does not permit us to say in what cases the illusion was conscious of itself. All that we can say is, that sometimes it was so. One cannot lead for years the life of a wonder-worker without being often cornered, — without having one's hand forced by the public. The man who has a legend in his lifetime is led tyrannically by his legend. One begins by artlessness, credulity, absolute innocence, — one ends in all sorts of embarrassments; and, in order to sustain the divine power which is at fault, he gets out of these embarrassments by the most desperate expedients. When one is pushed to the wall, must he leave the work of God to perish because God is slow to show himself? Did not Joan of Arc more than once make her Voices speak in response to the need of the moment? If the account of the secret revelation which she made to King Charles VII. has any reality, — which it is difficult to deny, — it must be that this innocent girl gave out as supernatural intuition what she had heard in confidence. An exposition of religious history which does not throw some cross-light upon suggestions of this sort, is by that very fact argued to be incomplete.

Every true or probable or possible circumstance must then have place in my narration, together with its shade of probability. In such a history it was necessary to speak not only of what actually took place, but also of that which may probably have taken place. The impartiality with which I treated my subject forbade me to reject a supposition, even

a painful one; for undoubtedly there was much to shock in the way things came to pass. From beginning to end I have applied the same process in an inflexible manner. I have spoken the good impressions which the texts have suggested to me; I must not, therefore, be silent as to the bad. I have wished that my book might keep its value even in the day when people should come to regard a certain amount of fraud as an element inseparable from religious history. It was necessary to make my hero noble and charming, — for undeniably he was so; and that, too, in spite of actions which in our days would be judged unfavorably. I have been praised for attempting to construct a narrative living, human, and possible. Would my work have deserved these praises if it had pictured the origins of Christianity as absolutely spotless? That would have been to admit the greatest of miracles; and the result of this would have been a picture lifeless to the last degree. I do not say that in lack of faults I ought to have invented some. At all events, I must leave each text to produce its melodious or discordant note. If Goethe were now alive he would commend me for this scruple. That great man would not have forgiven me for producing a portrait wholly celestial: he would have desired to find repellent features; for, assuredly, in actual life things happen which would wound us if only it were given to us to see them. Still, as such matters are brimful of edification, I have thought it my duty to select from the "Life of Jesus" a small volume in which nothing can affront the pious souls that have no care for criticism. I have entitled it "Jesus," to distinguish it from the present work, which alone makes part of the series entitled "History of the Origins of Christianity."[1] None of the changes made in the edition here offered to the public affects that little volume: I shall never make any alterations in it.

The same difficulty presents itself, moreover, in the history of the Apostles. This history is admirable in its way; but what can be more shocking than the "speaking with tongues," which is attested by unexceptionable texts of Paul? Liberal

[1] Seven volumes, including the *Vie de Jésus*.

theologians admit that the disappearance of the body of Jesus was one of the grounds for the belief in the resurrection. What does that signify, but that the Christian conscience at that moment was two-sided; that one-half of that conscience gave birth to the illusion of the other half? If the same disciples had taken away the body, and then spread themselves over the city crying, "He is risen!" the imposture would have been called by the right name. But, no doubt, it was not the same persons who did the two things. For belief in a miracle to be accepted, it is indeed necessary that some one be responsible for the first rumour which is spread abroad; but, ordinarily, this is not the principal actor. His part is limited to making no protest against the reputation which has been given him. Even if he did protest, it would be useless; popular opinion would prove stronger than he. Thus the founder of Babism did not attempt to perform a single miracle; yet in his own lifetime he passed for a wonder-worker of the highest rank. In the miracle of La Salette,[1] people had a clear idea of the artifice; but the conviction that it did good to religion carried all before it. Fraud shared among many grows unconscious of itself; or, rather, it ceases to be fraud, and becomes misapprehension. Nobody in that case deceives deliberately; everybody deceives innocently. Formerly it was taken for granted that every legend implies deceivers and deceived; in our opinion, all the parties to a legend are at once deceived and deceivers. A miracle, in other words, presupposes three conditions: first, general credulity; second, a little complaisance on the part of some; third, tacit acquiescence in the principal actor. Let us not, through reaction against the brutal explanations of the eighteenth century, fall into the trap of hypotheses which imply effects without cause. Legend does not spring up of itself; outside help brings it to the birth. The points it rests on are often extremely slight. It is the popular imagination that makes the snowball; there was, however, an original nucleus. The two persons who

[1] *Affaire de la Salette*, evidence collected by J. Sabbatier, pp. 214, 252, 254 (Grenoble, Vellot, 1856).

composed the two genealogies of Jesus, knew quite well that the lists were not of any great authenticity. The apocryphal books, the alleged apocalypses of Daniel, Enoch, and Esdras, proceed from persons of strong convictions; but the authors of these works knew well they were neither Daniel, Enoch, nor Esdras. The Asiatic priest who composed the romance of Thekla declared that he had done it out of love for Paul.[1] We should say the same of the author of the Fourth Gospel, surely a person of first-rate importance. Drive the illusion of religious history out of one door, and it re-enters by another. In fine, one can hardly mention a great event of the past which took place in an entirely defensible manner. Shall we cease to be Frenchmen because France was founded by centuries of perfidy? Shall we refuse to profit by the benefits of the Revolution because the Revolution committed crimes without number? If the house of Capet had succeeded in creating for us a good constitutional law-court, like that of England, should we wrangle over the cure of the "king's evil"?

Science alone is pure, for science has nothing to do with practice: it does not touch men; the Propaganda takes no heed of it. Its duty is to prove, not to persuade or to convert. He who has discovered a theorem publishes its demonstration for those who can understand it. He does not go up into a pulpit; he does not gesticulate; he has no recourse to oratorical artifices to get it adopted by those who do not perceive its truth. Enthusiasm, certainly, has its good faith, but it is the good faith of a child; it is not the deep reflective good faith of the critical scholar. The ignorant yield only to bad reasonings. If Laplace had had to gain the multitude over to his system of the world, he could not have limited himself to mathematical demonstrations. M. Littré, in writing the Life of a man whom he regards as his master, could push candour so far as to leave nothing unsaid, however it might lower him in general esteem. That is without example in religious history. Science alone seeks after pure truth. She alone offers

[1] *Confessum id se amore Pauli fecisse.* — Tertull. *De Bapt.* 17.

good reasons for truth, and carries a severe criticism into the employment of her means of conviction. This is no doubt the reason why, till now, she has had no influence on the people. In the future, perhaps, when people are better instructed, as we are led to hope they may be, they will yield only to good formal proofs. But it would not be fair to judge the great men of the past on such grounds. There are natures that resign themselves to impotence, — that accept humanity, with all its weaknesses, such as it is. Many great things could not have been accomplished without lies or without violence. If to-morrow the incarnate ideal were to come and offer itself to men to govern them, it would find itself confronted by folly, which wishes to be deceived; by self-will, which insists on being beaten down. The only one without reproach is the contemplative man, who aims simply to find the truth, without caring either to make it triumph or to apply it to facts.

Ethics is not history. To paint and to relate is not to approve. The naturalist who describes the transformations of a chrysalis neither blames nor praises it. He does not tax it with ingratitude because it abandons its shroud; he does not regard it as rash because it unfolds its wings; he does not accuse it of folly because it aspires to soar into space. One may be the passionate friend of the true and the beautiful, and yet show himself indulgent to the simple ignorance of the people. The ideal alone is spotless. Our happiness has cost our fathers torrents of tears and rivers of blood. In order that pious souls may taste at the foot of the altar the inward consolation which gives them life, it has needed centuries of tyrannical restraint, the mysteries of sacerdotal polity, a rod of iron, fires of martyrdom. The respect due to every great institution demands no sacrifice of historical good faith. Formerly, to be a good Frenchman, it was necessary to believe in Clovis's dove, in the national antiquities of the Treasure of Saint Denis, in the virtues of the oriflamme, in the supernatural mission of Joan of Arc; it was necessary to believe that France was the first of nations, that French royalty was superior to all other royalties, that God had a predi-

lection for that crown wholly unique, and was constantly engaged in protecting it. To-day we know that God protects equally all kingdoms, all empires, all republics; we own that many kings of France have been contemptible men; we recognise that the French character has its faults; we frankly admire a multitude of things which come from abroad. Are we on that account worse Frenchmen? We can say, on the contrary, that we are better patriots; since, instead of being blind to our faults, we seek to correct them, and in place of maligning the foreigner, seek to imitate the good there is in him. In like manner we are Christians. He who speaks with irreverence of mediæval royalty, of Louis XIV., of the Revolution, of the Empire, commits an act of bad taste. He who does not speak gently of Christianity and of the Church of which he forms a part makes himself guilty of ingratitude. But filial gratitude ought not to be carried to the length of closing our eyes to the truth. One is not wanting in respect to a government when he points out that it has not succeeded in satisfying the conflicting needs that are in man; or to a religion, in saying that it is not free from the formidable objections which science raises against all supernatural belief. Responding to certain social demands and not to certain others, governments fall by the very causes that have founded them and made their strength. Responding to the aspirations of the heart despite the protests of reason, religions crumble away in turn, because no force hitherto has succeeded in stifling reason.

Disastrous to Reason the day when she should stifle religion! Our planet, believe me, is toiling at some mighty task. Do not pronounce rashly upon the inutility of such and such of its parts; do not say that it is needful to suppress this wheelwork, which seems only to thwart the play of the others. Nature, which has endowed the animal with an infallible instinct, has put into humanity nothing deceptive. From his organs you may fearlessly infer his destiny. *Est Deus in nobis.* Religions are false when they attempt to prove the infinite, to define it, to incarnate it (if I may so speak); but they are true when they affirm it. The greatest errors they import into

that affirmation are nothing compared to the value of the truth which they proclaim. The simplest of the simple, provided he practise heart-worship, is more enlightened as to the reality of things than the materialist who thinks he explains everything by chance or by finite causes.

INTRODUCTION.

TREATING PRINCIPALLY OF THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS OF THIS HISTORY.

A HISTORY of the "Origins of Christianity" ought to embrace all that obscure and (so to speak) subterranean period which extends from the first beginnings of this religion to the time when its existence becomes a public fact, notorious and apparent to every eye. Such a history would consist of four parts. The first, which I now present to the public, treats of the particular fact which was the starting point of the new religion, and is wholly filled with the sublime personality of the Founder. The second would treat of the Apostles and their immediate disciples; or, rather, of the revolutions which took place in religious thought in the first two generations of Christianity. This would end about the year 100, when the last friends of Jesus were just dead, and when all the books of the New Testament had almost assumed the form in which we now read them. The third would set forth the state of Christianity under the Antonines. We should here observe it slowly unfolding, and waging an almost constant war against the empire, which latter, having at that moment attained to the highest degree of administrative perfection, and being governed by philosophers, contends against the growing sect as a secret and theocratic society, which obstinately disowns and continually undermines it. This part would embrace the whole of the second century. The fourth and last part would show the decided progress of Christianity from the time of the Syrian emperors. Here we should see the elaborate structure created by the Antonines crumbling away: the decay of ancient civilisation becomes irrevocable, and Christianity profits by its ruin; Syria conquers the entire West, and Jesus, with the gods and deified sages of Asia, takes possession of a

society for which philosophy and a purely civil government are no longer enough. It is then that the religious ideas of the races settled upon the coasts of the Mediterranean undergo a great change: Eastern religions everywhere take the lead; Christianity, having become a very numerous Church, totally forgets its dreams of a millennium, breaks its last connections with Judaism, and passes entirely into the Greek and Roman world. The strifes and the literary labours of the third century, which now stand out in open day, would be described only in their general features. Still more briefly I should relate the persecutions of the early years of the fourth century, the last effort of the Empire to return to its old principles, which wholly refused to religious associations a place in the State. Finally, the change of policy which under Constantine inverted the position, and made of the most free and most spontaneous religious movement an official worship, subject to State control, and in its turn persecutor, would need only to be foreshadowed.

I do not know whether I shall have life and strength to fill out so vast a plan. I shall be satisfied if, after writing the Life of Jesus, it is given to me to relate, as I understand it, the history of the Apostles; the condition of the Christian conscience during the weeks which immediately succeeded the death of Jesus; the formation of the cycle of legends touching the resurrection; the first acts of the Church in Jerusalem; the life of Saint Paul; the crisis at the time of Nero, the appearance of the Apocalypse, the ruin of Jerusalem, the foundation of the Hebrew-Christian sects of Batanæa; the compilation of the Gospels, and the rise of the great schools of Asia Minor. Everything pales by the side of that marvellous first century. By a peculiarity rare in history, we see much better what passed in the Christian world from the year 50 to 75, than from the year 80 to 150.

The plan upon which this history proceeds prevents the introduction into the text of long critical dissertations upon controverted points. An unbroken series of notes puts the reader in a position to verify in their original sources all the propositions in the text. These notes are strictly limited to citations at first hand, — I mean, to the indication of the original passages upon which each assertion or conjecture rests. I am aware that to persons little trained in these studies many other explanations would have been necessary; but it is not my habit to do over

again what has once been done and well done. To cite only books written in French, those who will consult the works named below,[1] which are for the most part excellent, will find explained in them a multitude of points upon which I have had to be very succinct. In particular, the detailed criticism of the Gospel texts has been done by Strauss in a manner which leaves little to be desired. Though he may at first have been deceived in his theory regarding the authorship of the Gospels,[2] and though his book, in my opinion, has the fault of keeping far too closely on theological and far too little on historic ground,[3] it is indis-

[1] A. Réville: *Études critiques sur l'Évangile de St. Matthieu*, Leyden, 1862. E. Reuss: *Histoire de la théologie chrétienne au siècle apostolique; Hist. du canon des Écritures saintes dans l'Église chrétienne*, Strasburg, 1860, 1862. M. Nicolas: *Des doctrines religieuses des Juifs pendant les deux siècles antérieurs à l'ère chrétienne; Études critiques sur la Bible* (N. T.), Paris, 1860, 1864. D. F. Strauss: *Vie de Jésus* (tr. by M. Littré); *Nouvelle Vie de Jésus* (tr. by Nefftzer and Dollfus), Paris, 1856, 1864. G. d'Eichtal: *Les Évangiles*, Ptie. 1; *Examen crit. et compar. des trois premiers Évangiles*, Paris, 1863. T. Colani: *J.-C. et les Croyances messianiques de son temps*, Strasburg and Paris, 1854. A. Stap: *Études hist. et crit. sur les origines du Christianisme*, Paris, 1866. R. de Liessol, *Études sur la biogr. évang.*, London, 1854. *Revue de théol. et de phil. chrétienne*, 1850–57; *Nouvelle Rev. de théol.*, 1858–62; *3d sér.*, from 1863, Strasburg and Paris.

[The following original authorities are easily accessible in English: Book of Enoch, edited by R. H. Charles (with comparison of recent Ethiopic and Greek texts), Oxford, 1893. Psalms of Solomon (Greek and English), Ryle and James, Cambridge. The Sybilline Oracles in English blank verse, by M. S. Terry, Hunt and Eaton, New York. Apocryphal Gospels, tr. by B. H. Cowper, Williams and Norgate, London, 1867. Gospel according to the Hebrews, fragments tr. by E. W. B. Nicholson, C. Kegan Paul, London, 1879. Standard critical authorities are Emil Schürer, A History of the Jewish People in the time of Jesus Christ, tr. by John Macpherson, Clark, Edinburgh, 5 vols., 1885, 1890; and A. Hausrath, A History of the N. T. Times, Williams and Norgate, London. Editions of the Apocryphal books (*Evang. Apocr.* and *Apocal. Apocr.*), edited by Tischendorf, were published by H. Mendelssohn, Leipzig, 1876; and the O. T. Apocrypha, in Greek and English, by Bagster, London, 1871.]

[2] The important results obtained on this point have all been acquired since the first edition of Strauss's work; while in his successive editions the learned critic has done justice to them with great candour.

[3] There is hardly need to remark that not a word in Strauss's book

pensable, if one would understand the motives which have guided me in a multitude of details, to follow the argument (always judicious, though sometimes a little subtle) of his book, which has been so well translated by my learned co-worker, M. Littré.

In respect of ancient testimony, I believe I have not overlooked any source of information. Not to mention a multitude of scattered data, we still have five great collections of writings respecting Jesus and the times in which he lived. These are: first, the Gospels and the New Testament writings in general; second, the compositions called the "Apocrypha of the Old Testament;" third, the works of Philo; fourth, those of Josephus; fifth, the Talmud. The writings of Philo have the inestimable advantage of showing us the thoughts which in the time of Jesus stirred souls occupied with great religious questions. Philo lived, it is true, in quite a different sphere of Judaism from Jesus; yet, like him, he was quite free from the Pharisaic spirit which reigned at Jerusalem. Philo is, in truth, the elder brother of Jesus. He was sixty-two years of age when the prophet of Nazareth had reached the highest point of his activity, and he survived him at least ten years. What a pity it is that the accidents of Philo's life did not direct his steps into Galilee! What would he not have taught us!

Josephus, who wrote chiefly for the Pagans, has not the same sincerity of style. His meagre accounts of Jesus, John the Baptist, and Judas the Gaulonite are dry and colourless. We feel that he seeks to represent these movements, so profoundly Jewish in character and spirit, in a form which would be intelligible to Greeks and Romans. Taken as a whole, I believe the passage in regard to Jesus to be authentic. It is perfectly in the style of Josephus; and if that historian mentioned Jesus at all, it is just in this manner that he would have spoken of him. We feel, however, that the hand of a Christian has retouched the fragment, adding to it words without which it would have been

justifies the strange and absurd calumny by which it has been attempted to discredit, among superficial readers, a work so convenient, exact, thoughtful, and conscientious, though in its general views hurt by a too rigid system. Not only Strauss has never denied the existence of Jesus, but every page of his book implies that existence. What is true is that the author supposes the individuality of Jesus to be more nearly effaced, and so lost to us, than perhaps it is in fact.

well nigh blasphemous;[1] also abridging and modifying some expressions.[2] It is necessary to remember that Josephus owed his literary fortune to the Christians, who adopted his writings as essential documents of their sacred history. It is probable that in the second century they circulated an edition of them corrected according to Christian ideas. At all events, that which constitutes the immense interest of the books of Josephus in respect of our present subject is the vivid light they throw on the times. Thanks to this Jewish historian, Herod, Herodias, Antipas, Philip, Annas, Caiaphas, and Pilate are personages whom, so to speak, we touch, and see living before us with a vivid personality.

The Apocrypha of the Old Testament, especially the Jewish portion of the Sibylline Poems, the Book of Enoch, the Assumption of Moses, the Fourth Book of Esdras, the Apocalypse of Baruch, together with the Book of Daniel (which is also itself a real Apocrypha), possess a primary importance in the history of the development of the messianic theories, and in the understanding of the conceptions of Jesus regarding the kingdom of God.[3] The Book of Enoch, in particular, and the Assumption of Moses were much read in the circle of Jesus.[4] Some expressions imputed to Jesus by the Synoptics are presented in the epistle attributed to Saint Barnabas as belonging to Enoch, — ὡς Ενὼχ

[1] "If it is permitted to call him man."

[2] Instead of ὁ χριστὸς οὗτος ἦν, it was probably χριστὸς οὗτος ἐλέγετο. Cf. *Antiquities*, XX. ix. 4. Origen, *In Matt.* x. 17; *Contra Celsum*, i. 47, ii. 13.

[3] On this subject may be consulted Alexandre, *Carmina Sibyllina* (Paris, 1851–56); Reuss, *les Sibylles chrétiennes*, in the *Revue de théologie*, April and May, 1861; Colani, *Jésus-Christ et les croyances messianiques*, p. 16 *et seq.*, with the works of Ewald, Dillmann, Volkmar, Hilgenfeld [and others, especially Charles's "Book of Enoch" (Oxford, 1893), and the volumes of Schürer. Sufficiently full accounts of these Apocryphal books, with ample illustration from their texts, will be found in the fifth and closing volume of Renan's "History of the People of Israel," (Boston, 1895)].

[4] Ep. of Jude, ver. 6, 14; 2 Pet. ii. 4; Test. of the 12 Patriarchs, *pass.*; Jud. 9 (see Origen, *De Principiis*, III. ii. 1); Didymus Alex. (*Max. Bibl. Vet. Patr.* iv. 336). Cf. Matt. xxiv. 21 *et seq.*, with *Assumpt. Mosis*, viii. x. (Hilgenfeld's ed. p. 105); and Rom. ii. 15, with the same, pp. 99, 100.

λέγει.[1] It is very difficult to determine the date of the different sections of which the book attributed to that patriarch is composed.[2] None of them are certainly anterior to the year 150 B. C.: some of them may even have been written by a Christian pen. The section containing the discourses called "Similitudes," and extending from chapter xxxvii. to chapter lxxi., is suspected of being a Christian work. But this has not been proved. I am disposed to think that the Gospels contain allusions to this portion of "Enoch," or at least to similar passages (see below, p. 366, note). Perhaps this part is merely proved to have been altered. Other Christian additions or revisions are recognisable here and there.[3]

The collection of the Sibylline verses needs the like distinctions, but these are more easily established. The oldest part is the poem contained in Book III., ver. 97–817; it appears to belong to about the year 140 B. C. Respecting the date of the Fourth Book of Esdras, everybody now is nearly agreed in assigning this Apocalypse to the year 97 A. D. It has been altered by the Christians. The Apocalypse of Baruch[4] has a great resemblance to that of Esdras; we find there, as in the Book of Enoch, several utterances imputed to Jesus.[5] As to the Book of Daniel, the character of the two languages in which it is written; the use of Greek words; the clear, precise, dated announcements of events which go back as far as the times of Antiochus Epiphanes; the false descriptions of ancient Babylon; the general tone of the book, which has nothing suggestive of the writings of the Captivity, but on the contrary corresponds, by numerous analogies, with the beliefs, the manners, the turn of imagination, of the

[1] Barn. iv. xvi. (*Cod. Sinait.*, ed. Hilg., 8, 52); cf. Enoch, lxxxix. 56 *et seq.*; Matt. xxiv. 22; Mark xiii. 20. See other like coincidences below (p. 48, n.; 105, n.; 340, n.). Compare also the language of Jesus reported by Papias (Iren. *Adv. Hær.* V. xxxiii. 3, 4) with Enoch x. 19, and with Apoc. of Baruch, § 29 (Ceriani, *Monum. Sacr. et prof.* I. i. 80).

[2] [See note, Hist. of Israel, v. 20.]

[3] The passage lxvii. 4 *et seq.*, in which the volcanic phenomena near Pozzuoli are described, does not prove the entire section to be later than A. D. 79, the date of the great eruption of Vesuvius. Allusions to like phenomena appear in Rev. ix., which belongs to A. D. 68.

[4] Lately published in a Latin translation from the Syriac by Ceriani (*Anecd. sacr. et prof.*, vol. i. fasc. 2, Milan, 1866).

[5] See preceding notes.

epoch of the Seleucidæ; the apocalyptic form of the visions; the position of the book in the Hebrew canon, which is outside the series of the Prophets; the omission of Daniel in the panegyrics of chapter xlix. of Ecclesiasticus, in which his rank was (as it were) hinted at, — with many another proof, a hundred times deduced, — do not permit a doubt that this book is a product of the general exaltation produced among the Jews by the persecution of Antiochus. It is not in the old prophetic literature that it must be classed; its place is at the head of apocalyptic literature, as the first model of a kind of composition after which were to come the various Sibylline poems, the Book of Enoch, the Assumption of Moses, the Apocalypse of John, the Ascension of Isaiah, and the Fourth Book of Esdras.

Hitherto, in the history of the origins of Christianity, the Talmud has been too much neglected. I think, with Geiger, that the true notion of the circumstances among which Jesus appeared must be sought in this strange compilation, where so much knowledge is mixed with the most worthless pedantry. Since Christian and Jewish theology have followed mainly two parallel paths, the history of the one cannot be understood without the history of the other. Innumerable material details in the Gospels find, moreover, their commentary in the Talmud. The vast Latin collections of Lightfoot, Schöttgen, Buxtorf, and Otho contained already on this point a mass of information. I have taken upon myself to verify in the original all the citations that I have made, without an exception. The assistance which has been given in this part of my task by a learned Israelite, M. Neubauer, well versed in Talmudic literature, has enabled me to go further, and to elucidate certain parts of my subject by some new illustrations. The distinction between epochs is here very important, — the compilation of the Talmud extending from the year 200 to 500, or thereabout. We have given as much precision as was possible in the present condition of these studies. Dates so recent will excite fears among persons accustomed to attach value to a document only for the period in which it was written. But such scruples would here be out of place. Jewish teaching from the Asmonean epoch down to the second century was chiefly oral. The mental habit thence resulting must not be judged by the customs of an age in which writing is common. The Vedas, the Homeric poems, the ancient Arabic lays, were for centuries

preserved in memory, and yet these compositions present a very distinct and delicate form. In the Talmud, on the other hand, the form has no value. We may add that before the Mishna of Juda the saint, which wiped out the recollection of all the others, there were several essays at compilation, beginning farther back, perhaps, than is commonly supposed. The style of the Talmud is that of lecture-notes; the editors probably did no more than to arrange under certain titles the enormous medley of writings which, for generations, had accumulated in the different schools.

It remains for us to speak of the documents which, claiming to be biographies of the founder of Christianity, must naturally take the place of honour in a Life of Jesus. A complete treatise on the compilation of the Gospels would be a work of itself. Thanks to the excellent work which for the last thirty years has been devoted to this question, a problem which might once have been held to be beyond our reach has found a solution quite sufficient for the requirements of history, though there is room still left for much uncertainty. We shall have occasion later on to revert to this, seeing that the composition of the Gospels was one of the most important facts for the future of Christianity that took place during the second half of the first century. We shall touch here only a single aspect of the subject, but this one is indispensable to the solidity of our narrative. Setting aside all that belongs to a picture of the apostolic times, we will inquire only to what extent data furnished by the Gospels can be employed in a history constructed on rational principles.[1]

That the Gospels are in part legendary is quite evident, inasmuch as they are full of miracles and of the supernatural; but there are legends and legends. Nobody disputes the principal features in the life of Francis of Assisi, although we meet the supernatural in it at every step. Contrariwise, no one gives credence to the "Life of Apollonius of Tyana," for the reason that it was written long after his own time, and avowedly as a pure romance. When, by whom, and under what conditions were the Gospels compiled? This is the chief question upon which the opinion we are to form of their credibility depends.

[1] Those desiring ampler treatment may consult, besides the works before noted, the writings of Reuss, Scherer, Schwalb, Scholten (tr. by Réville), in the *Revue de théologie*, and of Réville in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, May and June, 1866.

We know that each of the four Gospels bears at its head the name of a person well-known either in apostolic history or in the gospel history itself. If these titles are correct, it is clear that the Gospels, without ceasing to be in part legendary, acquire a high value, since they take us back to the half-century which followed the death of Jesus, and even in two cases to eye-witnesses of his acts.

As for Luke, doubt is hardly possible. The Gospel of Luke is a studied composition, founded upon earlier documents.[1] It is the work of a man who selects, prunes, and combines. The author of this Gospel is undoubtedly the same as that of the Acts of the Apostles.[2] Now, the author of the Acts appears to be a companion of Paul,[3] an appellation which exactly fits Luke.[4] I am aware that more than one objection can be raised against this opinion; but one thing is beyond question: that the author of the third Gospel and of the Acts is a man belonging to the second apostolic generation, and this is sufficient for our purpose. The date of that Gospel may, however, be determined with quite enough precision by considerations drawn from the book itself. The twenty-first chapter of Luke, which is inseparable from the rest of the work, was certainly written after the siege of Jerusalem, but not very long after.[5] We are here, then, on solid ground; for we have to do with a work all written by the same hand, and its unity is perfect.

The Gospels of Matthew and Mark do not show nearly the same stamp of individuality. They are impersonal compositions, in which the author wholly disappears. A proper name written at the head of such works does not count for much. We cannot, moreover, reason here as in the case of Luke. The date which belongs to a particular chapter (to Matthew xiv. or Mark xiii.,

[1] Luke i. 1–4.

[2] Acts i. 4.

[3] From xvi. 10, forward, the writer speaks of himself as an eye-witness.

[4] Col. iv. 14; Philem. 24; 2 Tim. iv. 11. As the name *Luke* (abridged from *Lucanus*) is quite rare, we have not to apprehend here one of those homonyms which occasion so much perplexity in questions of N. T. criticism.

[5] See ver. 9, 20, 24, 28, 29–32, and compare xxii. 36. These passages are the more striking, since the writer feels the peril in predictions of so near date, and guards against it, either by softening such passages as Mark xiii. 14-24, 29; Matt. xxiv. 15–29, 33; or else by question and answer, as in Luke xvii. 20, 21.

for example) cannot be rigorously applied to these writings as a whole, for they are made up of fragments from epochs and sources quite distinct. In general, the third Gospel appears to be later than the first two, and exhibits the character of a much more advanced composition. We cannot, however, conclude hence that the two Gospels of Mark and Matthew were in the same condition as we have them when Luke wrote his. These two works, entitled Mark and Matthew, in fact, long remained in a pliant condition (so to speak), and were susceptible of additions. On this point we have an excellent witness from the first half of the second century. This was Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, a grave man, a traditionist, who was busy all his life in collecting what could be learned from any one about Jesus.[1] After declaring that in such cases he preferred oral tradition to books, Papias mentions two writings on the acts and words of Christ, — first, a writing of Mark, the interpreter of the Apostle Peter, a short, incomplete composition, without chronological order, including narratives and discourses (λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα), composed from the information and recollections of the Apostle Peter;[2] second, a collection of sayings (λόγια) written in Hebrew[3] by Matthew, "which every one has translated[4] as he could." Certain it is that these two descriptions accord pretty well with the general tenor of the two books now called the "Gospel according to Matthew" and the "Gospel according to Mark," — the former characterised by its long discourses; the second mainly anecdotic, and much more exact than the other on minor details, brief even to dryness, the discourses meagre and indifferently composed. Nevertheless, that these two works as read by us are precisely like those read by Papias is not to be asserted, — first, because the composition of

[1] In Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 39. No question can be raised as to the authenticity of this passage. Eusebius, in fact, far from exaggerating the authority of Papias, is embarrassed by his *naïveté*, his crude millenarianism, and gets out of it by treating him as a man of narrow mind. Compare Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, III. i. 1; V. xxxviii. 3, 4.

[2] Papias, on this point, refers to a still older authority, that of "John the Elder" (see, as to this person, *post*, pp. 57, 58, *note*.

[3] That is, in the Semitic [Aramean] dialect.

[4] Ἡρμήνευσε, referring as it does to ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ, can only mean "translate." A few lines before, ἑρμηνευτής occurs in the sense of *dragoman*.

Matthew, according to Papias, was made up solely of discourses in Hebrew, different translations of which were in circulation; and, secondly, because the writings of Mark and of Matthew were to him perfectly distinct, drafted without any collusion, and it would seem in different languages. Now, in the present state of the texts, Matthew and Mark present parallel passages so long, and so perfectly identical, that we must suppose either that the final compiler of the first had the second before him (or *vice versâ*), or that both copied from the same original. What appears most probable is that we have not the original composition of either Matthew or Mark; that the first two Gospels as we have them are adaptations, in which it was attempted to fill up the voids in one text from the other. In fact, every one wished to possess a complete copy. He whose copy contained only discourses required narrative, and contrariwise. In this way "The Gospel according to Matthew" is found to have taken in nearly all the anecdotes of Mark; and "The Gospel according to Mark" contains to-day many of the details which have come from the *Logia* of Matthew. Each, moreover, drew largely from the oral tradition subsisting around him. This tradition is so far from having been exhausted by the Gospels, that the "Acts of the Apostles" and the earliest Fathers cite many sayings of Jesus apparently authentic, which are not found in the Gospels that we possess.

It matters little for our present purpose that we should press this analysis further, or attempt, on the one hand, to reconstruct after a fashion the original *Logia* of Matthew, or, on the other, to piece together the primitive story just as it left the pen of Mark. The *Logia* are doubtless represented in the longer discourses of Jesus, which make up a considerable portion of the first Gospel. These discourses, in fact, when detached from the rest, form a complete enough whole. As for the original narratives of Mark, the text of them seems to make its appearance now in the first, now in the second Gospel, but oftener in the second. In other words, the plan of the life of Jesus in the Synoptics is founded on two original documents, — first, the discourses of Jesus collected by the Apostle Matthew; second, the collection of anecdotes and of personal information which Mark committed to writing from the recollections of Peter. It may be said that we still possess these two documents, mixed up with

facts from another source, in the first two Gospels, which bear, accurately enough, the titles, "Gospel according to Matthew" and "Gospel according to Mark."

In any case, we cannot doubt that the discourses of Jesus were very early reduced to writing in the Aramean tongue; also, that his remarkable actions were very early taken down. These were not texts settled and fixed dogmatically. Besides the Gospels which have come down to us, there were others claiming equally to set forth the tradition of eye-witnesses.[1] Little importance was given to these writings, while conservatives like Papias, in the first half of the second century, still preferred the oral tradition.[2] Believing that the world was near its end, they had not much inclination to write books for the future; the sole concern was to keep in their heart the living image of him whom they hoped soon again to see in the clouds. Hence the small authority of the Gospel texts for nearly a hundred years. No scruple was felt at inserting paragraphs in them, or combining various narratives, or filling out one from another. The poor man who has only one book wishes it to contain all that is dear to his heart. These little books were lent by one to another; each transcribed into the margin of his copy the phrases and parables he found in others which affected him.[3] The loveliest thing in

[1] Luke i. 1, 2; Origen, *Homil. in Luc.* (init.); *Jerome*, *Comm. in Matt.*, *proleg.*

[2] Papias in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 39. Cf. Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* III. ii. iii. See also concerning Polycarp in the fragment of an epistle from Irenæus to Flavius, preserved by Eusebius, *H. E.* v. 20. Ὡς γέγραπται, in Barnabas *Ep.* chap. iv. p. 12 (ed. Hilgenfeld) applies to words found in Matt. xxii. 14; but those words, which occur twice in Matt. (xx. 16, xxii. 14), may be taken here from an apocryphal book, as is the case in Matt. xxiii. 34–36; xxiv. 20–28. (Cf. 4. Esd. viii. 3.) Note in the same chapter of Barnabas (p. 8) the singular coincidence of a passage ascribed to Enoch (employing the formula γέγραπται) with Matt. xxiv. 22; and compare γραφή as cited in Barn. chap. xvi. (p. 52), with Enoch lxxxix. 56. (See below, p. 366, n.) In the 3d ep. of Clement, chap. ii., and Justin, 1 *Apol.* 67, the Synoptics are clearly cited as sacred. In 1 Tim. v. 18 we have an example of a proverb (found also in Luke x. 7), or common saying, cited as "scripture" (λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή). This epistle, it may be remarked, was not written by Saint Paul.

[3] Thus the touching narrative in John viii. 1–11 has always been current, without finding a fixed place in the accepted Gospels.

the world was thus wrought out by a process obscure and wholly popular. No edition possessed an absolute value. The two epistles attributed to Clement of Rome quote the sayings of Jesus with notable variations.[1] Justin, who often appeals to what he calls "Memoirs of the Apostles," had before him a form of written gospel a little different from what we have; at all events, he takes no pains to quote them verbally.[2] The Gospel citations in the pseudo-Clementine homilies, of Ebionite origin, present the same character. The spirit was everything, the letter nothing. It is when tradition weakens, in the latter half of the second century, that texts bearing the names of apostles or apostolic men assume a decisive authority and obtain the force of law. Even then free compositions were not absolutely interdicted; following the example of Luke, special Gospels continued to be written by recasting at will the substance of older texts.[3]

Who does not own the value of documents constructed thus out of the tender recollections and simple narratives of the first two Christian generations, still full of the strong impression produced by the revered founder, which seems to have long survived him? Let us add that these Gospels seem to have proceeded from those branches of the Christian family which were most closely related to Jesus. The final labour of compilation of the text which bears the name of Matthew appears to have been done in one of the countries situated to the northeast of Palestine, — such as Gaulonitis, Auranitis, and Batanæa, where many Christians took refuge at the time of the Roman war, where were still to be found in the second century relatives of Jesus,[4] and where the first Galilean impulse was longer felt than elsewhere.

So far we have spoken only of the three Gospels called the Synoptics. It now remains to speak of the fourth, which bears the name of John. Here the question is much more difficult. Polycarp, the most intimate disciple of John, who often quotes the Synoptics in his epistle to the Philippians, makes no allusion

[1] Clem. *Epist.* i. 13; ii. 12.

[2] Τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων, ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια. (The last words perhaps are interpolations.) Justin, *Apol.* i. 16, 17, 33, 34, 38, 45, 66, 67, 77, 78; *Tryph.* 10, 17, 41, 43, 51, 53, 69, 70, 76–78, 88, 100, 101, 108, 111, 120, 125, 132.

[3] See, concerning Tatian's Gospel in Theodoret, *Hæret. Fab.* i. 30.

[4] Julius Africanus in Eusebius, *H. E.* i. 7.

to the Fourth Gospel. Papias, who was equally attached to the school of John, and who, if he had not been his hearer, as Irenæus holds, had associated a great deal with his immediate disciples, — Papias, who had eagerly collected all the oral accounts relative to Jesus, does not say a word of a "Life of Jesus" written by the Apostle John.[1] If such a mention had been found in his work, Eusebius, who puts in relief everything that bears on the literary history of the apostolic age, would undoubtedly have mentioned it.[2] Justin, perhaps, knew the Fourth Gospel;[3] but he certainly did not regard it as the work of the Apostle John, since he expressly designates that apostle as the author of the Apocalypse, and takes not the least account of the Fourth Gospel in the numerous facts of the life of Jesus which he extracts from the "Memoirs of the Apostles." More than this, upon all the points where the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel differ he adopts opinions at complete variance with the latter.[4] This is all the more surprising, seeing that the dogmatic tendencies of the Fourth Gospel must have marvellously suited Justin.

[1] Eusebius, *H. E.* iii. 39. One would be tempted to find the Fourth Gospel in the "narrations" of Aristion or the traditions of him whom Papias calls "John the Elder." But Papias seems to offer these narrations and traditions as unwritten. If the extracts given by him were from that Gospel, Eusebius would have said so. Besides, the views of Papias, so far as we know them, are those of a millenarian, a believer in the Apocalypse, not at all one of the school of theology found in the Fourth Gospel.

[2] Let it not be said that Papias says nothing of Luke or Paul, and yet their writings were known in his day. Papias must have been an opponent of Paul, and he may not have known the composition of Luke, which was made in Rome for quite another Christian circle. But how, living at Hierapolis, in the very heart of the Johannine School, could he have ignored the Gospel written by such a master? Nor let it be said, that, as to Polycarp (iv. 14) and Theophilus (iv. 24), Eusebius does not set forth all the citations made by them from the N. T. scriptures. The special aim of the chapter (iii. 39) regarding Papias made a mention of the Fourth Gospel almost inevitable, if Eusebius found it in his writings.

[3] A few passages — *Apol.* i. 32, 61; *Tryph.* 88 — lead one to think so. The theory of the *Logos* in Justin is not such that we are forced to suppose it to be taken from the Fourth Gospel.

[4] See references in note, p. 49. Observe especially *Apol.* i. 14 *et seq.*, making it plain that Justin either did not know the discourses in John, or did not regard them as representing the teaching of Jesus.

The same remarks apply to the pseudo-Clementine Homilies. The words of Jesus quoted by that book are of the synoptic type. In two or three places[1] there are, it would seem, facts borrowed from the Fourth Gospel. But the author of the Homilies certainly does not accord to that Gospel an apostolic authority, since on many points he puts himself in direct contradiction with it. It appears that Marcion (about 140) could not have known this Gospel, or else attributed to it no importance as an inspired book.[2] This Gospel accorded so well with his ideas that if he had known it he would have adopted it eagerly, and would not have been obliged, so as to have an ideal Gospel, to make a corrected edition of Luke. Finally, the apocryphal Gospels which may be referred to the second century, like the *Protevangelion* of James, the Gospel of Thomas the Israelite,[3] work upon the synoptic canvas, but they take no account of the Gospel of John.

The intrinsic difficulties which result from the reading of the Fourth Gospel itself are not less forcible. How is it that, by the side of information so precise, and in places felt to be that of eye-witnesses, we find discourses totally different from those of Matthew? How is it that the Gospel in question does not contain a parable or an exorcism? How can we explain — side by side with a general plan of the life of Jesus, which seems in some respects more satisfactory and more exact than that of the Synoptics — those singular passages in which one perceives a dogmatic interest peculiar to the author, ideas most foreign to Jesus, and sometimes indications which put us on our guard as to the good faith of the narrator? How is it, finally, that by the

[1] *Homil.* iii. 52; xi. 26; xix. 22. It is to be noted that the citations seemingly made from the Fourth Gospel by Justin and the writer of the Homilies coincide in part with one another, and show the same departures from the canonical text. (Compare with the above citations Justin, *Apol.* i. 22, 61; *Trypho*, 69.) From this we might infer that the two writers consulted, not the Fourth Gospel, but a source from which the writer of that Gospel may have drawn.

[2] The passages of Tertullian, *De carne Christi*, 3, and *Adv. Marc.* iv. 3, 5, prove nothing against what is here said.

[3] The apocryphal "Acts of Pilate" in our possession, which assume the Fourth Gospel, are nowise what Justin (*Apol.* i. 35, 48) and Tertullian (*Apol.* 20) speak of. It is even likely that the two Fathers speak of these Acts only from hearsay, and not as having read them.

side of views the most pure, the most just, the mostly truly evangelical, we find those blemishes which we would rather look upon as the interpolation of an ardent sectary? Is it indeed John, the son of Zebedee, the brother of James (who is not once mentioned in the Fourth Gospel), who can have written in Greek those lectures of abstract metaphysics, to which the Synoptics offer no analogy? Is this the essentially Judaising author of the Apocalypse,[1] who, in so few years, has divested himself to this extent of his style and of his ideas? Can an "Apostle of the Circumcision"[2] have composed a work more hostile to Judaism than the whole of Saint Paul's, a work in which the word "Jew" is almost equivalent to "enemy of Jesus"?[3] Is it indeed he, whose example was invoked by the partisans of the celebration of the Jewish passover in favour of their opinion,[4] who could speak with a sort of disdain of the "Feasts of the Jews" and of the "Passover of the Jews"?[5] All this is important. For my part, I reject the idea that the Fourth Gospel could have been written by the pen of a quondam Galilean fisherman. But that, taken all in all, this Gospel may have proceeded, about the end of the first century or the beginning of the second, from one of the schools of Asia Minor attached to John, that it presents to us a version of the life of the Master worthy of high consideration and often of preference, is indeed rendered probable, both by external evidence and by examining the document under consideration.

In the first place, no one doubts that about the year 170 the Fourth Gospel did exist. At that date there broke out at Laodicea on the Lycus a controversy relative to the Passover, in which this Gospel played an important part.[6] Apollinaris,[7] Athenagoras,[8] Polycrates,[9] the author of the epistle to the

[1] Compare Justin, *Trypho*, 81. The Apocalypse is of the year 68. Supposing John ten years younger than Jesus, he must have been then about 60.

[2] Gal. ii. 9. The words in Revel. ii. 2, 14, seem to contain a hostile reference to Paul.

[3] See almost all the passages containing the word Ἰουδαῖοι.

[4] Polycrates in Eusebius, *H. E.* v. 24.

[5] John ii. 6, 13; v. 11; vi. 4; xi. 55; xix. 42.

[6] Eusebius, *H. E.* iv. 26; v. 23–25. *Chron. Pasc.* p. 6 *et seq.* (ed. Du Cange.)

[7] *Ibid.*

[8] *Legatio pro Christ.* 10.

[9] In Euseb. *H. E.* v. 42.

Churches of Vienne and of Lyons,[1] professed already in regard to the alleged narrative of John the opinion which soon became orthodox. Theophilus of Antioch (about 180) said positively that the Apostle John was the author of it;[2] Irenæus[3] and the Canon of Muratori[4] attest the complete triumph of this Gospel, a triumph after which there was no longer any doubt.

Now, if, about the year 170, the Fourth Gospel appeared as a writing of the Apostle John and invested with full authority, is it not evident that at this date it was not a thing of yesterday? Tatian[5] and the author of the epistle to Diognetus[6] seem indeed to have made use of it. The part played by this Gospel in Gnosticism, and especially in the system of Valentinus,[7] in Montanism,[8] and in the controversy of the Alogi,[9] is not less remarkable, and shows that from the last half of the second century this Gospel was included in every controversy, and served as a corner-stone for the development of dogma. The school of John is the one whose progress is the most apparent during the second century;[10] Irenæus proceeded from the school of John, and between him and the Apostle there was only Polycarp. Now, Irenæus has not a doubt as to the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel. Let us add that the first epistle attributed to John is, according to all appearances, by the same author as the Fourth Gospel;[11] the epistle seems to have been known to

[1] In. Euseb. *H. E.* v. 1. [2] *Ad Autolychum*, ii. 22.

[3] *Adv. Hær.* II. xxii. 5; III. i. Cf. Euseb. *H. E.* v. 8.

[4] Line 9 *et seq.*

[5] *Adv. Græc.* 5, 7. It is, however, doubtful whether the Gospel Harmony composed by Tatian included the Fourth Gospel: the title *Diatessaron* probably did not originate with Tatian himself (cf. Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 29; Theodoret, *Haeret. Fab.* i. 20; Epiphan. *Adv. Hær.* xlvi. 1; Fabricius *Cod. Apocr.* i. 378).

[6] Chap. 6–9, 11. The passages of the Ignatian epistles in which allusions to the Fourth Gospel have been thought to exist are of doubtful genuineness. The authority of Celsus, sometimes alleged, is of no account, since Celsus was a contemporary of Origen.

[7] Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* I. iii. 6; III. xi. 7. Hippol. *Phil.* VI. ii. 29; VII. i. 22, 27.

[8] Iren. *Adv. Hær.* III. xi. 9.

[9] Epiphan. *Adv. Hær.* I. i. 3, 4, 28; liv. 1.

[10] Iren. *Epist. ad Florinum* (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 26; iii. 39).

[11] 1 John i. 3, 5. The style of the epistle is very like that of the Gospel, with the same favorite turns of expression.

Polycarp;[1] it was, it is said, cited by Papias;[2] Irenæus recognised it as John's.[3]

But if now we seek light in the reading of the work itself, we shall remark, first, that the author therein always speaks as an eye-witness. He wishes to pass for the Apostle John, and it is clearly seen that he writes in the interest of that Apostle. In every page he betrays the design of fortifying the authority of the son of Zebedee, of showing that he was the favourite of Jesus, and the most clear-sighted of his disciples;[4] that on all solemn occasions (at the Supper, at Calvary, at the Tomb) he held the chief place. The relations of John with Peter, which were on the whole fraternal, although not excluding a certain rivalry;[5] the hatred, on the other hand, of Judas,[6] — a hatred probably anterior to the betrayal, — seem to break through here and there. At times one is constrained to believe that John in his old age, having read the gospel accounts then current, on the one hand remarked various inaccuracies,[7] on the other was chafed at seeing that in the history of Christ he was not accorded an important enough place; that then he began to relate a multitude of things better known to him than to the others, with the intention of showing that in many instances, where Peter only was mentioned, he had figured with and before him.[8] Even during the life of Jesus these petty sentiments of jealousy had been

[1] *Ad Phil.* 7 : cf. 1 John iv. 2, 3; but this may be a mere coincidence, the two being of the same school and period. The genuineness of the epistle of Polycarp is disputed.

[2] Eusebius, *H. E.* iii. 39. It would be strange if Papias, who did not know the Gospel, knew the epistle. Eusebius only says that Papias makes use of evidence taken from this epistle. All turns on a few words which Eusebius (a bad judge of a question in criticism) may have believed to be borrowed from the epistle.

[3] *Adv. Hær.* III. xvi. 5, 8 ; cf. Euseb. *H. E.* v. 8.

[4] John xiii. 23–26; xviii. 15, 16; xix. 26; xx. 2–5; xxi. 7, 20–24.

[5] John xviii. 15, 16; xx. 2–6; xxi. 15–19 (cf. i. 35, 40, 41).

[6] John vi. 71; xii. 6; xiii. 21–26.

[7] The way in which "John the Elder" expressed himself in the Gospel of Mark (Papias in Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 39) implies a friendly view of it, or rather a sort of apology, seeming to imply that the disciples of John had a better view of their own on the same point.

[8] Compare John xviii. 15, 16 with Matt. xxvi. 58; John xx. 2–6 with Mark xvi. 7. See also John i. 35–39; xiii. 24, 25; xxi, 7, 20–24.

betrayed between the sons of Zebedee and the other disciples.[1] Since the death of James, his brother, John remained the sole inheritor of the intimate memories which the two apostles, by common consent, had shared. Those might be preserved in the circle of John; and, as the ideas of the times in the matter of literary good faith differed much from ours, a disciple, or rather one of those numerous sectaries, already half-Gnostic, who from the end of the first century, in Asia Minor, began to modify greatly the idea of Christ,[2] might be tempted to take the pen for the apostle, and to make on his own account a free revision of his Gospel. It would cost him no more to speak in the name of John than it cost the pious author of the Second Epistle of Peter to write a letter in the name of the latter. Identifying himself with the beloved disciple of Jesus, he espoused all his sentiments, even his littlenesses. Hence this perpetual effort of the supposed author to recall that he is the last surviving eye-witness,[3] and the pleasure he takes in relating circumstances which could be known only to him. Hence so many petty minute details which would fain pass as the commentaries of an annotator, — "it was the sixth hour;" "it was night;" "that man was called Malchus;" "they had lighted a fire of coals, for it was cold;" "the coat was without seam."[4] Hence, finally, the bad arrangement of the compilation, its irregular flow, the disjointedness of the earlier chapters, — so many inexplicable features if we go on the supposition that our Gospel is a mere theological treatise without historic value, yet perfectly comprehensible if we regard it as the recollections of an old man, arranged without the assistance of him from whom they proceeded, — sometimes of surprising freshness, and again strangely altered.

An important distinction, in fact, is to be remarked in the Gospel of John. This Gospel, on the one hand, presents a sketch of the life of Jesus which differs considerably from that of the Synoptics. On the other, it puts into the mouth of Jesus discourses whose tone, style, character, and doctrines have nothing in common with the sayings reported in the Synoptics. In

[1] See *post*, p. 194.

[2] See Col. ii. 8, 18. 1 Tim. i. 4; vi. 20. 2 Tim. ii. 18.

[3] John i. 14; xix. 35; xxi. 24 *et seq.* (Cf. 1 Ep. of John i. 3, 5.)

[4] Some of these points can have no real value: i. 40; ii. 6; iv 52; v. 5, 19; vi. 9, 19; xxi. 41.

this latter view the difference is such that one must make an out-and-out choice. If Jesus spoke as Matthew would have us believe, he could not have spoken in the manner represented by John. Between these two authorities no one has hesitated, or will ever hesitate. A thousand leagues apart from the simple, disinterested, and impersonal tone of the Synoptics, the Gospel of John shows at every step the prepossession of the apologist, the mental reservations of the sectary, the desire to establish a point and to convict his adversaries.[1] It was not by pretentious tirades, clumsy, badly written, and appealing little to the moral sense, that Jesus founded his divine work. Even though Papias had not informed us that Matthew wrote the sayings of Jesus in their original tongue, the natural tone, the indescribable good faith, the incomparable charm of the discourses contained in the Synoptic Gospels, their profoundly Hebraic turn of thought, the analogies they present to the sayings of the Jewish doctors of the period, their perfect harmony with the Galilean nature, — all these characteristics, compared with the obscure Gnosticism and the distorted metaphysics which fill the discourses of John, speak loudly enough. This does not mean that there are not to be found in the discourses of John some marvellous gleams, some traits that really proceed from Jesus.[2] But the mystical tone of these discourses corresponds in nothing to the character of the eloquence of Jesus, such as it is pictured to us in the Synoptics. A new spirit breathes through them; Gnosticism has already found a footing; the Galilean era of the kingdom of God is at an end; the hope of the near advent of Jesus is farther off; we enter the arid realm of metaphysics, the darkness of abstract dogma. The spirit of Jesus is not here; and if the son of Zebedee has indeed traced those pages, we must suppose that in writing them he had forgotten the Lake of Gennesareth and the charming conversations he had heard upon its banks.

One circumstance, moreover, which proves indeed that the discourses reported by the Fourth Gospel are not bits of history, but that they ought to be regarded as compositions designed to

[1] See, for example, chap. ix. and xi.; and remark especially the strange effect of such passages as xix. 35; xx. 31; xxi. 20–25, contrasted with the absence of like reflections in the Synoptics.

[2] For instance, iv. 1–24; xv. 12–17. Many sayings reported in the Fourth Gospel are found also in the Synoptics (xii. 46; xv. 20).

cover with the authority of Jesus certain doctrines dear to the author, is their complete harmony with the intellectual condition of Asia Minor at the time they were written. Asia Minor was then the theatre of a strange movement of syncretic philosophy; abundant germs of Gnosticism existed there already. Cerinthus, a contemporary of John, said that an Æon named *Christos* was united by baptism to the man named Jesus, and had separated from him on the cross.[1] Some of the disciples of John appear to have drunk deeply from these strange springs. Can we affirm that the apostle himself had not been subject to the same influences,[2] that he did not experience something like the change wrought in Paul, of which the Epistle to the Colossians is the principal witness?[3] No, certainly not. It may be that after the crisis of 68 (the date of the Apocalypse), and of the year 70 (the ruin of Jerusalem), the old apostle, with an ardent and plastic soul, disabused of the belief of the near appearance of the Son of Man in the clouds, inclined toward the ideas that he found around him, many of which amalgamated quite well with certain Christian doctrines. In imputing these new ideas to Jesus, he would only follow a very natural leaning. Our recollections are, like everything else, transformable; the ideal of a person we have known changes as we change. Regarding Jesus as the incarnation of truth, John may well have attributed to him that which he himself had come to accept as the truth.

It is nevertheless much more probable that John himself had no part in this; that the change was made around him rather than by him, and doubtless after his death. The long age of the apostle may have terminated in such a state of feebleness that he was in a measure at the mercy of those around him.[4] A secretary

[1] Iren. *Adv. Hær.* I. xxvi. 1.

[2] The expressions *logos* (Rev. xix. 13) and *lamb of God*, common to the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse, may be indications of this.

[3] Compare Col. i. 13–17, with the epistles to the Thessalonians, the oldest we have of Paul.

[4] Some traditions (Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 39) place beside him in his later years a namesake "John the Elder," who seems at times to have held the pen for him and acted as his substitute. In this view, the superscription *ὁ πρεσβύτερος* of the second and third epistles of John, which seem to us of the same hand with the first epistle, gives room for argument. Still, the existence of this "John the Elder" is not sufficiently established. It seems to have been imagined for the convenience of those who, through

might take advantage of this state to make one whom everybody called, *par excellence*, "the Elder" (ὁ πρεσβύτερος) speak in his own style. Certain parts of the Fourth Gospel were added later; such is the whole of chapter xxi.,[1] in which the author seems to have resolved to render homage to the Apostle Peter after his death, and to answer the objections which might be drawn or were already drawn from the death of John himself (ver. 21–23). Several other passages bear traces of erasures and corrections.[2] Not being accounted as wholly the work of John, the book might well remain fifty years in obscurity. Little by little people got accustomed to it, and finished by accepting it. Even before it had become canonical, many may have made use of it as a book of some slight authority, yet very edifying.[3] On the other hand, the contradictions it offered to the Synoptic Gospels, which were much more widely circulated, prevented its being taken into account in constructing the life of Jesus, such as it was imagined to be.

In this mode we may explain away the strange contradictions presented in the writings of Justin and in the pseudo-Clementine Homilies, in which are to be found traces of our Gospel, while certainly we do not place it upon the same footing as the Synoptics. Hence also those allusions (so to speak), which are not direct quotations, made to it about the year 180; hence, finally, this singularity, that the Fourth Gospel seems to emerge slowly from the Church of Asia in the second century, being first adopted by

orthodox scruples, did not choose to ascribe the Apocalypse to the apostle (see p. 297, n., below). The argument drawn by Eusebius for this hypothesis from a passage of Papias is not decisive. The words ἢ τί Ἰωάννης in this passage may have been interpolated. In this case the words πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης, from the pen of Papias, would indicate the Apostle John himself (Papias applies expressly the term πρεσβύτερος to the apostles: cf. 1 Pet. vi.), and Irenæus would be right, as against Eusebius, in calling Papias a disciple of John. What confirms this conjecture is that Papias speaks of "John the Elder" as a direct disciple of Jesus.

[1] Chap. xx. 30, 31, are evidently the original ending.

[2] Chap. iv. 2 (cf. iii. 22); vii. 22; xii. 33, seem to be of the same hand with xxi. 19.

[3] Thus the Valentinians, who received it, and the author of the pseudo-Clementine Homilies, vary from it completely in reckoning the length of the ministry of Jesus. (Iren. *Adv. Hær.* I. iii. 3; II. xxii. 1 *et seq.* *Hom. Clem.* xvii. 19.)

the Gnostics,[1] but obtaining slight credence in the orthodox Church (as we see from the controversy on the Passover), and then universally recognised. I am sometimes led to believe that Papias was thinking of the Fourth Gospel when he set against the exact information in regard to the life of Jesus the long discourses and the singular precepts which others ascribe to him.[2] Papias and the old Judæo-Christian party must have regarded such novelties as very reprehensible. This could not have been the only instance that a book at first deemed heretical forced the gates of the orthodox Church, and became one of its rules of faith.

One thing, at least, I regard as very probable, — that the book was written before the year 100; that is to say, at a time when the Synoptics had not yet a complete canonicity. After this date it is impossible any longer to conceive that the author could free himself so completely from the framework of the "Apostolic Memoirs." To Justin, and apparently to Papias, the synoptic framework constitutes the true and only plan of the life of Jesus. One who under an assumed name wrote about the year 120–130 a fictitious Gospel would have contented himself with treating in his own way the received version, as the apocryphal Gospels do, and not have reversed from top to bottom what were regarded as the essential lines of the life of Jesus. This is so true, that, from the second half of the second century, these contradictions became a serious difficulty in the hands of the *Alogi*, and obliged the defenders of the Fourth Gospel to invent the most confused solutions.[3] Nothing proves that the author of the Fourth Gospel had, when writing, any of the Synoptic Gospels before his eyes.[4]

[1] Valentinus, Ptolemy, Heracleon, Basileides, Apelles, the Naäsenes [serpent-worshippers], the Peratæ (Iren. *Adv. Hær.* I. viii. 5; III. xi. 7. Origen in *Joann.* vi. 8 *et seq.* Epiph. *Adv. Hær.* xxxiii. 3; see especially *Philosophumena*, vi. and viii.). It may be that, in crediting citations from the Fourth Gospel to Basileides and Valentinus, the Fathers did not ascribe to these founders of schools the opinions which prevailed after them in these schools.

[2] In Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 39.

[3] Epiphan. *Adv. Hær.* I. i.; Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 24.

[4] The concords of Mark ii. 9 and John v. 8, 9; Mark vi. 37 and John vi. 7; Mark xiv. 4 and John xii. 5; Luke xxiv. 1, 2, 12, and John xx. 1, 4–6, though singular, are sufficiently explained by memories.

The striking similarities of his narrative to the other three Gospels as touching the Passion leads one to suppose that there was then for the Passion as well as for the Last Supper[1] a fairly well established account, which people knew by heart.

It is impossible at a distance to have the key to all these singular problems, and we should undoubtedly encounter many surprises if it were given to us to penetrate the secrets of that mysterious school of Ephesus, which seems more than once to have taken pleasure in obscure paths. But here is a capital test. Every person who sets himself to write the Life of Jesus without a decided opinion upon the relative value of the Gospels, allowing himself to be guided solely by his feeling of the subject itself, would in many instances be induced to prefer the narrative of the Fourth Gospel to that of the Synoptics. The last months of the life of Jesus especially are explained only by this Gospel; several details of the Passion, unintelligible in the Synoptics, assume both probability and possibility in the narrative of the Fourth Gospel.[2] On the other hand, I defy anybody to compose a rational Life of Jesus, who takes into account the discourses which the assumed John imputes to Jesus. This fashion of incessantly preaching himself and demonstrating his mission, this perpetual argumentation, this studied stage-effect, these long reasonings that accompany each miracle, these stiff and awkward discourses, whose tone is so often false and unequal,[3] could not be endured by a man of taste alongside the delightful utterances which, according to the Synoptics, constituted the soul of the teaching of Jesus. We have here evidently artificial essays,[4] which represent to us the discourses of Jesus in the same way as the "Dialogues" of Plato set forth the conversations of Socrates. They resemble the variations of a musician improvising on his own account upon a given theme. The theme itself may be in some degree authentic; but in the execution the artist gives his fancy free scope. We perceive the artificial pro-

[1] 1 Cor. xi. 23-26.

[2] For example, that concerning the announcement of the treachery of Judas.

[3] See, *e. g.*, ii. 25; iii. 32, 33, and the long discussions of chaps. vii. viii. and ix.

[4] The writer often seems to seek occasion to insert discourses (chaps. iii. v. viii. xiii.-xvi.).

gression, the rhetoric, the prearranged plan.[1] Let us add that the diction of Jesus is nowhere to be found in the discourses of which we speak. The expression "Kingdom of God," so common with the Master,[2] appears only once (iii. 3, 5). On the other hand, the style of the discourses attributed to Jesus by the Fourth Gospel offers the most complete analogy to that of the narrative parts of the same Gospel, and to that of the author of the epistles called John's. We see that the author of the Fourth Gospel, in writing these discourses, followed not his recollections, but the somewhat monotonous movement of his own thought. Quite a new mystical language is displayed in them, language characterised by the frequent employment of the words "world," "truth," "life," "light," "darkness," resembling much less that of the Synoptics than that of the Book of Wisdom, Philo, and the Valentinians. If Jesus had ever spoken in that style, neither Hebrew nor Jewish, how does it come that, among his hearers, only a single one has so well kept the secret ?

For the rest, literary history offers an example which presents a certain analogy to the historic phenomenon we have just described, and which serves to explain it. Socrates, who, like Jesus, did not write, is known to us through two of his disciples, Xenophon and Plato, — the former corresponding with the Synoptics in his clear, transparent, and impersonal style of composition; the latter, by his strong individuality, recalling the author of the Fourth Gospel. In order to expound the Socratic teaching, must we follow the "Dialogues" of Plato, or the "Talks" of Xenophon ? In such a case doubt is not possible ; every one sticks to the "Talks" and not to the "Dialogues." Does Plato nevertheless teach us nothing concerning Socrates ? In writing the biography of Socrates, would it be good criticism to neglect the Dialogues ? Who would dare to maintain this ?

Without pronouncing upon the main question, as to what hand indited the Fourth Gospel, — even if we were persuaded it was not that of the son of Zebedee, — we can admit, then, that this work possesses some title to be called the "Gospel according to John." The historic sketch of the Fourth Gospel is, in my

[1] For example, chap. xvii.

[2] Besides the Synoptics, this is evident in the Acts, the Pauline epistles, and the Apocalypse.

opinion, the life of Jesus as it was known to the immediate circle of John. It is also my belief that this school was better acquainted with numerous outward circumstances of the life of the founder than the group whose recollections go to make up the Synoptic Gospels. Notably, in regard to the sojourns of Jesus at Jerusalem, it was in possession of facts which the other churches had not. "John the Elder," who is probably not a different person from the Apostle John, regarded, it is said, the narrative of Mark as incomplete and confused; he even had a theory to explain the omissions of this narrative.[1] Certain passages in Luke, which are a kind of echo of the Johannine traditions,[2] prove, moreover, that the traditions preserved by the Fourth Gospel were not a thing entirely unknown to the rest of the Christian family.

These explanations will suffice, I think, to show the motives which in the course of my narrative have determined me to give the preference to this or that one of the four guides whom we follow in the life of Jesus. On the whole, I admit the four canonical Gospels as documents of good faith. All four belong to the century following the death of Jesus; but their historic value is very diverse. Matthew evidently merits especial confidence in respect of the discourses: here are the *Logia*, the very notes taken from a clear and lively memory of the teaching of Jesus. A sort of outburst at once mild and terrible, a divine force, if I may call it so, underlines these words, detaches them from the context, and to the critic renders them easily distinguishable. The person who undertakes the task of weaving out of the Gospel story a consecutive narrative has here an excellent touchstone. The actual words of Jesus, so to speak, reveal themselves:

[1] Papias, *loc. cit.* (See above p. 46).

[2] Such are the pardon of the sinful woman; the implied knowledge of the family at Bethany; the character of Martha, corresponding to διηκόνει in John (xii. 2); the idea given of the journeys of Jesus in Samaria, even (it would seem) of his several visits to Jerusalem; the curious likeness between the Lazarus of Luke and that of John; the incident of the woman who wiped the feet of Jesus with her hair; the idea that Jesus appeared at his trial before three authorities; the opinion indicated by the author of the third Gospel that several disciples were present at his crucifixion; the notices as to the part played by Annas in connection with Caiaphas; the apparition of the angel at Gethsemane (cf. John xii. 28, 29).

as soon as we touch them, in this chaos of traditions of unequal authority, we feel them throb with life; they translate themselves (as it were) spontaneously, and fit into the narrative of their own accord, standing out in high relief.

The narrative parts grouped in the first Gospel about this primitive nucleus have not the same authority. In them are to be found many legends of quite undefined outline, which proceeded from the piety of the second Christian generation.[1] The accounts which Matthew has in common with Mark show faults of transcription which prove a slight acquaintance with Palestine.[2] Many episodes are twice repeated, certain persons are duplicated, showing that different sources have been utilized and unskilfully mixed.[3] The Gospel of Mark is much more firm, more precise, less weighted with circumstances added at a later date. Of the three Synoptics it is the one which has remained the most primitive, the most original,[4] that to which were added the fewest later elements. Material details are given in Mark with a clearness which we should seek in vain in the other evangelists. He delights to report certain sayings of Jesus in Syro-Chaldean.[5] His observations are most minute, and come, no doubt, from an eye-witness. There is nothing to disprove that this eye-witness, who evidently had followed Jesus, who had loved him and observed him very closely, and who had preserved a lively image of him, was the Apostle Peter himself, as is maintained by Papias.

As for the work of Luke, its historic value is manifestly inferior. It is a document at second hand. Its manner of narration is more matured. The sayings of Jesus are there more reflective, more sententious. Some sentences are exaggerated and distorted.[6] Writing

[1] Especially chaps. i. ii. See also xxvii. 3–10, 19, 51–53, 60; xxviii. 2–7, comparing Mark.

[2] Comp. Matt. xv. 39 with Mark viii. 10. (See *Comptes rendus de l'Acad. des Inscr.*, etc., Aug. 17, 1866.)

[3] Comp. Matt. ix. 27–31; xx. 29–34, with Mark viii. 22–26; x. 46–52: Matt. xiii. 28–34 with Mark v. 1–20: Matt. xii. 38–42 with xvi. 1–4: ix. 34 with xii. 24–28.

[4] For example, compare Mark xv. 23 with Matt. xxvii. 34.

[5] Chaps. v. 41; vii. 34; xiv. 36; xv. 34. Matthew shows this quality only in xxvii. 46.

[6] Chap. xiv. 26. The rules of apostleship (x. 4, 7) have an especially exaggerated tone.

outside Palestine, and certainly after the siege of Jerusalem,[1] the author indicates the places with less exactness than the other two Synoptics; he is too fond of representing the temple as a house of prayer, where people go to perform their devotions;[2] he does not speak of the Herodians; he softens details in order to bring the different narratives into closer agreement;[3] he smooths over passages which had become embarrassing because of the more exalted idea which people around him had attained to in regard to the divinity of Jesus;[4] he exaggerates the marvellous;[5] he commits errors of chronology[6] and of topography;[7] he omits the Hebraic glosses;[8] he appears to know little of Hebrew;[9] he does not quote a word of Jesus in that language; he calls all the localities by their Greek names; he corrects at times in a clumsy manner the sayings of Jesus.[10] We perceive in the author a compiler, a man who has not himself seen the witnesses, who labours at the texts, and permits himself great violences in order to make them agree. Luke had probably under his eyes the original narrative of Mark and the *Logia* of Matthew. But he treats them with great freedom: at times he runs two anecdotes or two parables together to make one;[11] sometimes he divides one so as

[1] Chaps. xix. 41, 43, 44; xxi. 9, 20; xxiii. 29.

[2] Chaps. ii. 37; xviii. 10–13; xxiv. 53.

[3] Chap. iv. 16; comp. note 3 on chap. ii. (below).

[4] Chap. iii. 23; Mark. xiii. 32 and Matt. xxiv. 36 are omitted.

[5] Chaps. iv. 14; xxii. 43, 44.

[6] Regarding the taxing of Quirinius (Cyrenius), the revolt of Theudas, and perhaps the mention of Lysanias, — though as to this last his accuracy may be defended. (See *Mission de Phénicie*, p. 347 *et seq.*; *Corp. inscr. Gr.* No. 4521 with the *addenda*. Josephus, *Antiq.* XVIII. vi. 10; XIX. v. 1; XX. vii. 1: *Bell. Jud.* II. xi. 5, xii. 8.

[7] Comp. Luke xxiv. 13 with Josephus, *Wars*, VII. vi. 6 (ed. Dindorf); chap. i. 39 is also suspected of error.

[8] Comp. Luke i. 34 with Matt. i. 21; Luke xx. 46 with Matt. xxiii. 7, 8. Luke avoids the words *abba*, *rabbi*, *corbona*, *corban*, *raca*, *Boanerges*.

[9] Jerome *In Isaiam*, vi. (Opp. ed. Martianay, iii. 63, 64). The Hebraisms of his style, with certain Jewish traits (such as Acts i. 12), came probably from persons he talked with, books he read, and documents he followed.

[10] For example, ἔργων (Matt. xi. 19) becomes in Luke (vii. 35) τέκνων, which reading, by a sort of reflex action, has found its way into most MSS. of Matthew.

[11] For example, xix. 12–27, where the parable of the talents is confused

to make two.[1] He interprets the documents according to his own mind; he has not the absolute impartiality of Matthew and Mark. We might add, concerning his tastes and personal tendencies, that he is a very exact devotee;[2] he holds that Jesus has accomplished all the Jewish rites;[3] he is a passionate democrat and Ebionite: that is to say, much opposed to property, and is persuaded that the poor will soon have their revenge;[4] he is specially partial to the anecdotes which put into relief the conversion of sinners and the exaltation of the humble;[5] he frequently modifies the ancient traditions so as to give them this turn.[6] In his first pages he includes legends touching the infancy of Jesus, told with the long amplifications, the canticles, and the conventional proceedings, which constitute the essential feature of the apocryphal Gospels. Finally, in the account of the last hours of Jesus, he introduces some circumstances full of a tender sentiment, as well as certain sayings of Jesus of rare beauty,[7] not found in the more authentic narratives, in which can be detected the work of legend. Luke probably borrowed them from a later collection, in which the chief aim was to excite sentiments of piety.

A great reserve was naturally required in regard to a document of this nature. It would have been as little scientific to neglect

(ver. 12, 14, 15, 27) with one regarding rebel subjects. The parable of the rich man and Lazarus (chap. xvi.) contains features that have little to do with the main subject (the sores, the dogs, and ver. 23–27).

[1] Thus the feast at Bethany yields him two accounts (vii. 36–48; x. 38–42). So with the discourses: thus Matt. xxiii. is found in Luke xi. 39–41; xx. 46, 47.

[2] Chaps. xxiii. 56; xxiv. 53. Acts i. 12.

[3] Chap. ii. 21, 22, 39, 41, 42 (this is an Ebionitish trait). See *Philosophumena*, VII. vi. 34.

[4] As in the parable of Dives and Lazarus. See also vi. 20–23, 24–28 (comparing the milder form in Matt. v. 3–12); xii. 13–15; xvi. (throughout); xxii. 35. Acts ii. 44, 55; v. 1–11.

[5] The woman who anoints the feet of Jesus, the penitent thief on the cross, the pharisee and publican, the prodigal son.

[6] Thus the woman who anoints the feet becomes, in his account, a penitent sinner.

[7] Jesus weeping over Jerusalem, the bloody sweat, meeting with the holy women, the penitent thief, etc. The words spoken to the "daughters of Jerusalem" (xvii. 28, 29) can hardly have been thought of till after the siege of A.D. 70.

it as to employ it without discrimination. Luke had under his eyes originals which we no longer have. He is less an evangelist than a biographer of Jesus, — a "harmonist," a reviser, after the manner of Marcion and Tatian. But he is a biographer of the first century, a divine artist who, apart from the information he has extracted from more ancient sources, shows us the character of the founder with a felicity of touch, an inspired grasp, and a sharpness of relief which the two other Synoptics do not possess. His Gospel is the one which possesses most charm in the reading; for, not to mention the incomparable beauty of its subject-matter, he adds an element of art and skill which singularly enhances the effect of the portrait without seriously marring its truth.

To sum up, we are warranted in saying that the synoptic compilation has passed through three stages, — first, the original documentary stage (λόγια of Matthew, λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα of Mark), primary compilations no longer in existence; second, the stage of simple amalgamation, in which the original documents were thrown together without regard to literary form, and without betraying any personal traits on the part of the authors (the present Gospels of Matthew and Mark); third, the careful composition and studied compilation in which we are conscious of an effort made to reconcile the different versions (the Gospel of Luke, the Gospels of Marcion, Tatian, etc.). The Gospel of John, as we have said, is a composition of another order, and stands wholly by itself.

It will be observed that I have made no use of the apocryphal gospels. In no sense should these compositions be placed on the same footing as the canonical gospels. They are tiresome and puerile amplifications, having almost always the canonical documents for a base, and never adding anything to them of any value. Contrariwise, I have been most careful in collecting the shreds of ancient gospels preserved by the Fathers of the Church, which formerly existed simultaneously with the canonical but are now lost, — such as that according to the Hebrews, that according to the Egyptians, those attributed to Justin, Marcion, and Tatian.[1] The first two possess especial importance, since they were composed in Aramean, like the *Logia*

[1] For further details see Michel Nicolas, *Études sur les Évangiles apocryphes* (Paris, Lévy, 1886).

of Matthew, appearing to have formed a variation of the Gospel attributed to that apostle; and because they were adopted by the Ebionites, — that is to say, those small Christian sects of Batanæa which preserved the use of the Syro-Chaldaic tongue, and appear to have continued, in a sense, the lineage of Jesus. But it must be owned that in the condition they have come down to us they are inferior, in critical authority, to the compilation of Matthew which we possess.

It will now, I presume, be understood what sort of historic value I put upon the Gospels. They are neither biographies after the manner of Suetonius, nor fictitious legends after the manner of Philostratus; they are legendary biographies. I should class them frankly with the legends of the saints, the Lives of Plotinus, Proclus, Isidore, and other compositions of the same sort, in which historical truth and the desire to present models of virtue are combined in various degrees. Inexactness — a trait common to all popular compositions — is especially to be observed in them. Let us suppose that forty or fifty years ago three or four old soldiers of the Empire had set themselves, each by himself, to write a Life of Napoleon from their own memory. It is clear that their narratives would present numerous errors, great discordances. One of them would place Wagram before Marengo; another would boldly write that Napoleon ousted the government of Robespierre from the Tuileries; a third would omit expeditions of the highest importance. But one thing would certainly result from these simple narratives with a high degree of truth, — that is, the character of the hero, the impression he made around him. In this sense, such popular narratives would be worth more than a formal and official history. The same can also be said of the Gospels. Bent solely on bringing out strongly the excellency of the Master, his miracles, his teaching, the evangelists manifest entire indifference to everything that is not of the very spirit of Jesus. The contradictions in respect of time, place, and persons were regarded as insignificant; for the higher the degree of inspiration attributed to the word of Jesus, the less was ascribed to the compilers themselves. These regarded themselves only as simple scribes, and cared but for one thing, — to omit nothing of what they knew.[1]

[1] See the passage from Papias, before cited.

Without doubt, a certain share of preconceived ideas must have been mingled in these recollections. Several narratives, especially in Luke, are invented in order to bring out more vividly certain traits of the personality of Jesus. This personality itself underwent alteration every day. Jesus would be a unique phenomenon in history if, with the part which he played, he had not soon become transfigured. The legend respecting Alexander had its birth before the generation of his companions in arms was extinct; that respecting Saint Francis of Assisi began in his lifetime. A rapid work of transformation went on in the same manner in the twenty or thirty years which followed the death of Jesus, and stamped upon his biography the absolute traits of an ideal legend. Death makes perfect the most perfect man; it renders him faultless to those who have loved him. At the same time with the wish to paint the Master, came likewise the desire to explain him. Many anecdotes were devised to prove that the prophecies regarded as messianic had been fulfilled in him. But this procedure, whose importance is undeniable, would not suffice to explain everything. No Jewish work of the time gives a series of prophecies, precisely labelled, which the Messiah was destined to fulfil. Many of the messianic allusions prominent in the evangelists are so subtle, so indirect, that it is impossible to believe they all had relation to a generally admitted doctrine. Sometimes they reasoned thus: "The Messiah was to do such a thing; now, Jesus is the Messiah; therefore Jesus has done such a thing." Sometimes they reasoned inversely: "Such a thing has happened to Jesus; now, Jesus is the Messiah; therefore such a thing was to happen to the Messiah."[1] Too simple explanations are always false, when it is our task in hand to analyse the texture of those profound creations of popular sentiment which baffle all theories by their wealth and infinite variety.

It is scarcely necessary to say that with such documents, in order to present only what is indisputable, we must keep to the main lines. In almost all ancient histories, even in those which are much less legendary than these, detail gives rise to infinite doubts. When we have two accounts of the same fact, it is extremely rare that the two exactly agree. Is not this a reason, when we have only one, for falling into many a perplexity? We

[1] See, for example, John xix. 23, 24.

may say that among the anecdotes, the discourses, the celebrated sayings reported by the historians, there is not one strictly authentic. Were there stenographers to take down these fleeting words? Was there an annalist always present to note the gestures, the manner, the emotions of the actors? Let us try to attain to the truth as to the way in which such or such a contemporary fact took place: we shall not succeed. Two accounts of the same event given by two eye-witnesses differ essentially. Must we, then, reject all the colouring of the narratives, and confine ourselves to recording the bare facts only? That would be to suppress history. Of course, I am well aware that, if we except certain short axioms easily fixed in memory, not one of the discourses reported by Matthew is literally correct: there is hardly one of our stenographic reports which is so. I willingly admit that that marvellous account of the Passion embraces a multitude of trifling inaccuracies. Would it, however, be writing the history of Jesus to omit those discourses which exhibit to us in such a vivid manner the nature of his religious teaching, and to limit ourselves to saying, with Josephus and Tacitus, that "he was put to death by the order of Pilate at the instigation of the priests"? That would be, in my opinion, a kind of inaccuracy worse than that to which one exposes himself when admitting the details supplied by the texts. These details are not true to the letter, but they are truth of a higher order; they are truer than the naked truth, in the sense that they are truth rendered expressive and articulate, and raised to the height of an idea.

I beg those who think that I have placed an undue reliance on narratives which are in great part legendary, to take note of the observation I have just made. To what would the life of Alexander be reduced, if it were limited to that which is materially certain? Even traditions partly erroneous contain a portion of truth which history may not pass over. No one has blamed M. Sprenger because, in writing the Life of Mahomet, he set much store by the *hadith*, or oral traditions concerning the prophet, and often imputed to his hero words which are only known through this source. The traditions respecting Mahomet, nevertheless, have no historical value higher than the discourses and narratives which compose the Gospels. They were written between the year 50 and the year 140 of the Hegira. When the history of the Jewish schools in the ages which immediately pre-

ceded and followed the birth of Christianity shall be written, no one will make any scruple of attributing to Hillel, Shammai, or Gamaliel the maxims imputed to them by the *Mishna* and the *Gemara*, although these great compilations were formed many centuries after the time of the doctors just mentioned.

Those, on the other hand, who believe that history ought to consist in merely reproducing without comment the documents which have come down to us, are desired to take notice that such a course is not allowable. The four principal documents are in flagrant contradiction with one another; Josephus, moreover, sometimes corrects them all. We must make our choice. To assert that an event cannot take place in two ways at once, or in an absurd manner, is not to impose an *à priori* philosophy upon history. Because we have several different versions of the same fact, or because credulity has mixed with all these versions fabulous circumstances, the historian must not conclude that the fact is not a fact; but he ought, in such a case, to be very cautious, — to examine the texts, and to proceed by induction. There is especially one class of narratives to which this principle must necessarily be applied, — narratives of the supernatural. To seek to explain these narratives, or to treat them as legends, is not to mutilate facts in the name of theory; it is to begin with the study of the very facts themselves. None of the miracles which abound in the old histories took place under scientific conditions. Observation, which has not once been falsified, teaches us that miracles never take place save in times and countries in which they are believed, and in presence of persons disposed to believe them. No miracle ever took place in presence of a gathering of men capable of testing the miraculous character of the event. Neither common people nor men of the world are equal to this. It requires great precautions and long habit of scientific research. In our own days, have we not seen all sorts of people become dupes of the grossest frauds or of childish illusions? Marvellous facts, attested by the populations of small towns, have, thanks to closer investigation, been condemned.[1] Since it is proved that no contemporary miracle will bear discussion, is it not probable that the miracles of the past, which were all performed in popular gather-

[1] See the *Gazette des Tribunaux*, Sept. 10 and Nov. 11, 1851; May 28, 1857.

ings, would equally display their share of illusion if it were possible to criticise them in detail?

It is not, then, in the name of this or that philosophy, but in the name of unbroken experience, that we banish miracle from history. We do not say, "Miracle is impossible." We say, "So far, no miracle has ever been proved." If to-morrow a wonder-worker were to come forward with credentials sufficiently weighty to be discussed; if he were to announce that he was able, say, to raise the dead, — what would be done? A commission, composed of physiologists, physicists, chemists, persons trained in historical criticism, would be named. That commission would select the corpse, would assure itself that the death was indeed real, would designate the room in which the experiment should be made, would arrange a whole series of precautions, so as to leave no hold for doubt. If under such conditions the revival should take place, a probability almost equal to certainty would be established. As, however, it ought always to be possible to repeat an experiment, — to do over again that which has been done once, — and as, in the case of miracle, there can be no question of facility or difficulty, the wonder-worker would be invited to reproduce his marvellous feat under different circumstances, upon other bodies, in another place. If the miracle should succeed every time, two things would be proved, — first, that it takes place in a realm of supernatural events; second, that the power of bringing them to pass belongs, or is delegated to, certain individuals. But who does not see that a miracle never took place under these conditions; that hitherto the miracle-worker has always chosen the subject of the experiment, chosen the surroundings, chosen the public; that, moreover, it is the people themselves who most often, because of their invincible desire to see something divine in great events and great men, create afterward the marvellous legends? Until the order of things changes, we maintain it, then, as a principle of historical criticism, that a supernatural account cannot be admitted as such; that it always implies credulity or imposture; that it is the historian's duty to explain it, and search out what share of truth or of error it may conceal.

Such are the rules which have been followed in the composition of this work. In the reading of the texts, I have been able to combine with it an important source of information, — the view of

the scenes where the events occurred. The scientific mission, having for its object the exploration of ancient Phœnicia, which I directed in 1860 and 1861,[1] led me to reside on the frontiers of Galilee, and to travel thither frequently. I have traversed, in every sense of the term, the Gospel region; I have visited Jerusalem, Hebron, and Samaria; scarcely any important locality in the history of Jesus has escaped me. All this history, which seems at a distance to float in the clouds of an unreal world, took thus a form, a solidity, which astonished me. The striking agreement of the texts and the places, the marvellous harmony of the Gospel idea with the country which served it as a framework, were to me a revelation. Before my eyes I had a fifth Gospel, torn but still legible; and from that time, through the narratives of Matthew and Mark, I saw, instead of an abstract being who might be said never to have existed, an admirable human figure living and moving. During the summer, having to go up to Ghazir, in the Lebanon, to take a little repose, I fixed, in rapid sketches, the picture as it had appeared to me; and from these resulted this history. When a cruel affliction came to hasten my departure, I had only a few pages to write. In this manner the book was composed near the very places where Jesus was born and lived. Since my return,[2] I have laboured unceasingly to complete and arrange in detail the rough sketch which I had hastily written in a Maronite cabin, with five or six volumes around me.

Many will perhaps regret the biographical form which my work has thus taken. When, for the first time, I conceived the idea of writing a history of the origins of Christianity, my intention was, in fact, to produce a history of doctrines, in which men would hardly have a place. Jesus was to be barely named; I was especially bent on showing how the ideas developed under cover of his name took root and covered the world. But I have since learned that history is not a simple play of abstractions; that in it men are more than doctrines. It was not a particular theory of justification and redemption that caused the Reformation: it was Luther and Calvin. Parseeism, Hellenism, Judaism, might

[1] The work containing the results of this mission was published in 1864.

[2] My return was in October, 1861; the first edition of this book appeared in June, 1863.

have combined under all manner of forms; the doctrines of the Resurrection and of the Word might have gone on developing for ages without producing that grand, unique, and fruitful fact which is called Christianity. That fact is the work of Jesus, of Paul, of the Apostles. To write the history of Jesus, of Paul, and of the Apostles is to write the history of the origins of Christianity. Earlier movements do not belong to our subject except as serving to explain these extraordinary men, who, naturally, could not have existed apart from that which preceded them.

In such an effort, to make the great souls of the past live again, some degree of divination and of conjecture must be permitted. A great life is an organic whole, which cannot be exhibited by the mere heaping together of small facts. A profound sentiment must embrace the whole, and make its unity. The artist method in such a subject is a good guide; the exquisite tact of a Goethe would find a way to apply it. The essential condition of the creations of art is to form a living system, all whose parts are mutually dependent and connected. In histories of this kind, the great indication that we hold to the truth is to have succeeded in combining the texts in such a fashion as to constitute a logical and probable narrative, in which nothing shall be out of tune. The secret laws of life, of the progression of organic products, of the minute shadings of tone, ought to be consulted at each moment; for what is required to be reproduced is not the material circumstance, which it is impossible to verify: it is the soul itself of history. What must be sought after is not the petty certainty of minutiæ: it is the correctness of the general sentiment, the truth of colour. Each detail which departs from the rules of classic narration ought to warn us to be on our guard; for the fact which requires to be related has been conformed to the necessity of things, natural and harmonious. If we do not succeed in rendering it such by our narrative, it is only because we have not attained to seeing it aright. Suppose that, in restoring the Minerva of Phidias according to the texts, we produced a composition at once dry, raw, artificial: what must we conclude? Only one thing, — the texts lack an appreciative interpretation; we must woo them gently, until they can be made to join and furnish a whole in which all the parts are happily blended. Should we then be sure of having, feature by feature, the Greek statue? No; but we should not, at least, have the caricature of it: we

should have the general spirit of the work, — one of the forms in which it might have existed.

This sentiment of a living organism we have not hesitated to take as our guide in the general working out of the narrative. The reading of the Gospels would be sufficient to prove that the authors, although conceiving a very true idea of the life of Jesus, have not been guided by very rigorous chronological data. Papias, moreover, expressly tells us this, and bases his opinion upon evidence which seems to emanate from the Apostle John himself.[1] The expressions, *at this time, after that, then, and it came to pass*, etc., are mere transitions designed to connect different narratives with one another. To leave all the information furnished by the Gospels in the disorder in which tradition gives it, would no more be writing the history of Jesus than it would be writing the history of a celebrated man to give pell-mell the letters and anecdotes of his youth, his old age, and his maturity. The Koran, which presents to us, in the loosest manner possible, fragments of the different epochs in the life of Mahomet, has discovered its secret to ingenious criticism; the chronological order in which the fragments were composed has been detected in such a way as to leave little room for doubt. Such a re-arrangement is much more difficult in the Gospel, owing to the public life of Jesus having been shorter and less eventful than the life of the founder of Islam. Still, the attempt to find a thread which shall serve as a guide through this labyrinth ought not to be taxed with gratuitous subtlety. There is no great abuse of hypothesis in premising that a religious founder begins by keeping close to the moral aphorisms which are already in circulation, and to the practices which are in vogue; that, as he advances and gets full possession of his idea, he delights in a kind of calm and poetic eloquence, apart from all controversy, sweet and free as pure feeling; that, as he gradually warms, he is kindled by opposition, and ends with polemics and strong invectives. Such are the periods plainly distinguishable in the Koran. The order which, with extremely fine tact, is adopted by the Synoptics, supposes a similar course. If we read Matthew attentively, we shall find in the arrangement of the discourses a gradation very like that just indicated. There will be noticed also a reserve in the turns of expression which are

[1] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* iii. 39.

made use of when it is desired to show the progress of the ideas of Jesus. The reader may, if he prefers, see in the divisions adopted in this respect only the breaks indispensable for the methodical exposition of a profound and complicated thought.

If love for a subject can serve to give an understanding of it, it will also, I hope, be recognized that in this I have not been wanting. To construct the history of a religion, it is necessary, first, to have believed it, — without this, we should not be able to understand why it has charmed and satisfied the human conscience; in the second place, to believe it no longer in an absolute manner, since absolute faith is incompatible with honest history. But love persists apart from faith. By not attaching one's self to any of the forms which captivate the adoration of men, one does not renounce the appreciation of that which they contain of good and of beautiful. No transitory apparition exhausts the Divinity: God had revealed himself before Jesus; God will reveal himself after Jesus. Profoundly unequal, and so much the more Divine as they are grander and more spontaneous, manifestations of the God who hides himself in the depth of the human conscience are all of the same order. Jesus cannot, then, belong solely to those who call themselves his disciples. He is the common honour of all who carry a human heart. His glory does not consist in being banished from history; we render him a truer worship in showing that all history is incomprehensible without him.

NOTE. — In view of Renan's numerous and most instructive references to post-biblical Jewish authorities, the following titles of those most accessible are inserted here: —

Pirqé Aboth and *Pereq.* R. Meir (Hebrew and English), in Charles Taylor's "Sayings of the Jewish Fathers," — a thin 8vo printed by the Cambridge (Eng.) University Press, 1877: *Mishna Jerushalmith.*

THE TALMUD of Jerusalem and Babylon, translated into French and published by Moses Schwab (Paris, 1871–1887): 11 vols. royal 8vo. [The entire Talmud consists of sixty-three treatises, with a supplement of fifteen brief tracts, and was first published at Venice in 1523, in fifteen folio volumes: see a very full account in an article of twenty-four pages in M°Clintock and Strong's "Biblical, etc. Cyclopædia."]

THE LIFE OF JESUS.

CHAPTER I.

PLACE IN HISTORY.

The chief event in the world's history is the revolution by which the noblest portions of humanity passed from the ancient religions comprised under the vague name "Paganism" to a religion based on the divine unity, the trinity, and the incarnation of the Son of God. It took nearly a thousand years to make this conversion. The new religion itself was at least three hundred years in forming; but the revolution in question had its origin in an event which took place under the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius. There lived then a man of great religious genius, who, through his daring originality and the love he had the gift of inspiring, created the object and fixed the point of departure of the future faith of humanity.

Man, as soon as he became distinct from the brute, was at once religious; that is, he saw something in Nature beyond the actual, and for himself something beyond death. This sentiment, for thousands of years, went astray in the most singular manner. With many races it went no further than a belief in sorcerers, under the rude form in which we still find it in certain parts of Oceanica. Among some populations the religious

sentiment degenerated into the hideous scenes of butchery which characterise the ancient religion of Mexico. Other countries, Africa in particular, did not get beyond fetishism; that is, the adoration of a material object to which were attributed supernatural powers. As the instinct of love, which at moments elevates the most vulgar man above himself, sometimes takes the form of brutish lust and ferocity, so this divine faculty of religion might for a long time seem a cancer that must be extirpated from the human species, — a source of errors and crimes which wise men should make every effort to suppress.

The brilliant civilisations developed at a very remote period in China, in Babylonia, and in Egypt led to certain steps of progress in religion. China early attained to a sort of good common-sense, which prevented her from going very wildly astray. She knew nothing either of the advantages or the abuses of religious genius; at all events, she had in this direction no influence in guiding the great current of human life. The religions of Babylonia and Syria never disengaged themselves from a substratum of strange sensuality: those religions continued to be, until their extinction in the fourth and fifth centuries of our era, schools of immorality, in which at times, thanks to a kind of poetic intuition, there opened glimpses of the divine world. Egypt, in spite of a certain seeming fetishism, attained very early to metaphysical dogmas and a lofty symbolism. But these interpretations of a refined theology were unquestionably not primeval. Man, when possessed of a clear idea, has never amused himself by clothing it in symbols: it is oftenest after long reflection, and through the inability of the human mind to

resign itself to the absurd, that we seek for ideas under the old mystic images whose meaning is lost. It is not from Egypt, moreover, that the faith of humanity has come. Those elements in the faith of a Christian which, after undergoing a thousand transformations, have found their way from Egypt and Syria, are external forms of little consequence, or dross such as is always retained in the purest worships. The grand defect of these religions was their superstitious character; they only threw into the world millions of amulets and charms.[1] No great moral thought could go forth from races debased by a thousand years of despotism, and accustomed to institutions which permitted hardly any freedom of individual action.

The poetry of the soul — faith, liberty, honour, self-devotion — made its appearance in the world with the two great races which, in a sense, have created humanity: I mean the Indo-European and the Semitic races. The first religious intuitions of the Indo-European race were essentially naturalistic; but it was a profound and moral naturalism, a loving embrace of Nature by man, a delicious poetry full of the sentiment of the infinite, — in a word, the germ of all that the Germanic and Celtic genius, of all that in later times a Shakespeare and a Goethe, were to express. This was neither religion nor morality as known by reflection: it was melancholy, tenderness, imagination; above all, it was gravity of feeling, — that is to say, the essential condition of morals and religion. The faith of mankind, however, could not come from this source, since these old religions had much difficulty in detaching

[1] Abraxas: either an engraved gem (amulet), or a mystic symbol, as of the Gnostics (Cent. Dict.).

themselves from polytheism, and have never attained to a very clear symbol. Brahmanism has survived to our day only by virtue of the astonishing conservatism which India seems to possess; Buddhism failed in every attempt to reach the West. Druidism remained a form exclusively national, without universal application. The Greek attempts at reform — Orphic and other mysteries — did not avail to give solid nourishment to the soul. Persia alone succeeded in constructing a dogmatic religion of its own, almost monotheistic and skilfully organised; but it is quite possible that this organisation itself was only imitated or borrowed. In any case, Persia did not convert the world; on the contrary, she was converted when she saw the flag of the divine unity proclaimed by Islam displayed upon her borders.

It is the Semitic race[1] whose glory it is to have created the religion of humanity. Away beyond the confines of history, the Bedouin patriarch, under a tent kept free from the disorders of an already corrupted world, prepared a way for the world's faith. A violent antipathy against the voluptuous worships of Syria, a marked simplicity of ritual, a complete absence of temples, idolatry reduced to insignificant *teraphim*, — these constituted his superiority. Among all the tribes of the nomadic Semites, that of the Beni-Israel was already marked out for a great future. Ancient relations with Egypt (from which it borrowed we cannot easily tell how much) only served to enhance their hatred for idolatry. A "Law" (*Torah*) written in very ancient times on

[1] I would here observe that this name merely designates the peoples that speak, or spoke, one of the languages called "Semitic." Such a title is extremely imperfect; but it is one of those words (like "Gothic architecture" or "Arabic figures") which we have to keep for the sake of a common understanding, even after the error they imply has been disproved.

tables of stone, which they attributed to their great liberator Moses, was already the code of monotheism, and contained, when compared with the institutions of Egypt and Chaldæa, powerful germs of social equality and of morality. A portable chest ("ark"), surmounted by sphinxes,[1] with staples on the two sides through which to pass poles, made up all their ritual outfit. Here all the sacred possessions of the nation were collected,— its relics, its memorials, and finally the "book" (1 Sam. x. 25), the journal of the tribe, always open, in which entries were made with great discretion. The family charged with holding the poles and keeping watch over these portable archives, being near and having control of the book, very soon acquired much importance. The institution, however, which was to determine the future did not proceed from this. The Hebrew priest differed little from other priests of ancient times. The character which essentially distinguishes Israel among theocratic peoples is, that the priesthood has always been subordinated to individual inspiration. Besides its priests, each nomadic tribe had its *nabi*, or prophet, — a sort of living oracle, who was consulted upon obscure questions whose solution demanded a high intelligence. The prophets of Israel, formed into groups or schools, held very high rank. Defenders of the old democratic spirit, enemies of the rich, opposed to all political organisation and to whatever might attract Israel into the paths of other nations, they were the true agents of the religious pre-eminence of the Jewish people. Very early

[1] Compare Lepsius, *Denkmäler aus Ægypten und Æthiopien*, viii. pl. 245; De Rougé, *Étude sur une stèle égypt. appartenant à la Bibliothèque impériale* (Paris, 1888); De Vogüé, *Le Temple de Jérusalem*, p. 33; Guigniaut, ***Relig. de l'antiquité***, pl. No. 173.

they held forth unlimited hopes; and when the people, victims to some extent of their impolitic counsels, were crushed by the might of Assyria, they proclaimed that a boundless reign was in store for Judah, that Jerusalem would one day be the capital of the whole world, and that the human race would become Jewish. Jerusalem, with its temple, appeared to them as a city placed upon the summit of a mountain, toward which all peoples should throng; as an oracle whence the universal law should issue; as the centre of an ideal realm, where the human race, at peace under the rule of Israel, should find once more the delights of Eden.[1]

Obscure utterances began already to be heard, which extolled the martyrdom and celebrated the power of "the Man of Sorrows." Referring to one of those sublime sufferers who, like Jeremiah, stained the streets of Jerusalem with their blood, an inspired seer composed a song upon the sufferings and the triumph of the "servant of God," in which all the prophetic force of the genius of Israel seems to be gathered up: —

He grew up as a feeble shrub, and as a shoot sprouting out from desert ground, which has neither grace nor beauty. He was despised and rejected of men; all men turned away their faces from him; he was despised, and we esteemed him not. Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows; yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God and afflicted of him. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep were gone astray; we turned every one to his own way, and Jehovah hath laid on him the iniquity of us all. He was

[1] Isaiah ii. 1–4, especially xi. xii. lx.-lxx.; Micah iv. 1–5. It is to be noted that the second part of Isaiah, beginning with chap. xl., is not by the Isaiah of Hezekiah's time.

oppressed and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth; he was brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth. His grave was held as the grave of the wicked, and his death as that of the ungodly. But so soon as his life is made an offering for sin, he shall see his children's children; his days shall be prolonged, and the work of Jehovah shall prosper in his hand (Isaiah lii. 13–liii. 12).

Great alterations were made at the same time in the Book of the Law. New texts, such as Deuteronomy, were produced, assuming to represent the true law of Moses, but in reality of a spirit totally different from that of the old nomads. An ardent fanaticism was the main feature of this spirit. Infatuated believers provoked incessant acts of violence against everything that deviated from the worship of Jehovah; a code of blood, prescribing the penalty of death for religious offences, was successfully established. Piety almost always brings in its train strange contradictions of vehemence and tenderness. This zeal, unknown to the rude simplicity of the age of the Judges, inspired tones of eager prophecy and of tender emotion which the world until now had never heard. A strong tendency toward social questions was already making itself felt. Utopias, dreams of a perfect society, take their place in the code. The Pentateuch — a mixture of patriarchal morality and ardent devotion, of primitive intuitions with pious subtilties like those that filled the soul of Hezekiah, Josiah, or Jeremiah — was thus fixed in its present form, and became for ages the absolute rule of the national mind.

This great book once created, the history of the Jewish people developed with irresistible energy. The great empires which succeeded one another in western Asia,

while they crushed all its hope of a terrestrial kingdom, threw this people, with a certain sombre fury, into religious dreams. Caring little for national dynasty or political independence, they accepted all governments which permitted them to practise freely their worship and to follow their customs. Israel would no longer have other guidance than that of its religious enthusiasts, other enemies than those of the Divine unity, or other country than its own Law.

And this Law, it must be remarked, was wholly social and moral. It was the work of men penetrated with a high ideal of the present life, who believed they had found the best means of realising it. The universal conviction was that the *Torah*, closely followed, could not fail to give perfect felicity. This Torah has nothing in common with the Greek or Roman "Laws," which, caring for little else than abstract right, scarce enter into questions of private happiness and morality. We feel beforehand that the results to proceed from the Jewish Law will be of a social and not of a political order; that the work at which this people labours is a kingdom of God, not a civil republic, — a universal institution, not a nationality or a fatherland.

Admirably, through many a defeat, Israel held true to this calling. A series of pious men, — Ezra, Nehemiah, Onias, the Maccabees, — eaten up with zeal for the Law, succeeded one another in the defence of the ancient institutions. The idea that Israel was a holy people, a tribe chosen by God and bound to him by a covenant, took stronger and firmer root. A great expectation filled all souls. The whole of the Indo-European antiquity had placed paradise in the beginning; all its poets had wept a vanished golden age. Israel

placed the age of gold in the future. The Psalms, that perennial poesy of religious souls, with their divine and melancholy harmony, blossomed from this exalted piety. Israel became in fact and by eminence the people of God, while the Pagan religions around were more and more restricted, — in Persia and Babylonia, to an official charlatanism; in Egypt and Syria, to a gross idolatry; in the Greek and Roman world, to vain show. That which the Christian martyrs did in the first centuries of our era, — which the victims of persecuting orthodoxy in the very heart of Christianity have done up to our time, — the Jews did during the two centuries which precede the Christian era. They were a living protest against superstition and religious materialism. A wonderful activity of ideas, leading to the most opposite results, made of them at this period a people the most striking and original in the world. Their dispersion along the whole Mediterranean sea-coast, and the use of the Greek language which they adopted when out of Palestine, prepared the way for a propaganda the like of which ancient societies, cut up into petty nationalities, had never once exhibited.

Down to the time of the Maccabees, Judaism, while persistently announcing that it would one day be the religion of the human race, had had the characteristic of all the other worships of antiquity: it was a family and a tribal worship. The Israelite thought, indeed, that his worship was the best, and spoke with contempt of strange gods; but he believed, too, that the religion of the true God had been made for himself alone. One embraced the religion of Jehovah in entering the Jewish family: that was all (Ruth i. 16). No Israelite dreamed of converting the stranger to a worship which was the

patrimony of the sons of Abraham. The development of the pietist spirit, beginning with Ezra and Nehemiah, led to a conception much firmer and more logical. Judaism became, in an absolute sense, the true religion; the right of entering it was given to him who wished it (Esther ix. 27); soon it became a work of piety to bring into it the greatest number possible.[1] True, the generous sentiment which elevated John the Baptist, Jesus, and Saint Paul above the petty ideas of race did not yet exist; for, by a strange contradiction, these converts (proselytes) were little respected, and were even treated with disdain.[2] But the idea of an exclusive religion; the idea that there was something in the world superior to country, to blood, to laws; the idea which was to make apostles and martyrs, — had taken root. A profound pity for the Pagans, however brilliant their worldly fortune, was henceforward the sentiment of every Jew.[3] By a series of legends destined to furnish models of unconquerable endurance (Daniel and his companions, the mother of the Maccabees and her seven sons,[4] the romance of the race-course of Alexandria[5]), the guides of the people sought above all to

[1] Matt. xxiii. 15. Josephus, *Life*, 23; *Wars*, II. xvii. 10; VII. iii. 3; *Antiq.* XX. ii. 4. Horace, *Sat.* I. iv. 143. Juvenal, *Sat.* xiv. 96 *et seq.* Tacitus, *Ann.* ii. 85; *Hist.* v. 5. Dion Cassius xxxvii. 17. Slaves were often emancipated on condition of remaining Jews. Lévy (of Breslau), *Epigr. Beyträge zur Gesch. der Juden*, 229 *et seq.*

[2] Mishna, *Schebiit*, x. 9. Babyl. Talmud, *Niddah*, 13 *b*; *Jebamoth*, 47 *b*; *Kidduschin*, 70 *b*. Midrash, *Jalkut Ruth*, 163 *d*.

[3] Apocr. epistle of Baruch, in Fabricius, *Cod. pseud. V. T.*, ii. 147 *et seq.*, and in Ceriani, *Monum. sacra et profana*, I. ii. 96 *et seq.*

[4] 2 Macc. vii. and the *De Maccabœis* (ascribed to Josephus). Compare Hebrews, xi. 33–38.

[5] 3 Maccabees (apocryphal); Rufinus, *Supplem.* and Josephus, *Contra Apionem*, ii. 5.

inculcate this idea, — that virtue consists in a fanatical attachment to fixed religious institutions.

The persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes made of this idea a passion, almost a frenzy. It was something very like what happened under Nero two hundred and thirty years later. Rage and despair threw believers into a world of visions and dreams. The first apocalypse, the "Book of Daniel," appeared. It was like a revival of prophecy, though under a very different form from the ancient one, and with a much larger conception of the destinies of the world. The Book of Daniel gave, in some sort, the final expression to the Messianic hopes. The Messiah was no longer a king, after the pattern of David and Solomon, a theocratic and Mosaic Cyrus; he was a "Son of Man" appearing in the clouds (vii. 13, 14), a supernatural being clothed in human form, charged to judge the world, and to preside over the golden age. Perhaps the *Sosiosh* of Persia, the great prophet who was to come, charged with preparing the reign of Ormuzd, furnished some features for this new ideal.[1] The unknown author of the Book of Daniel had, in any case, a decisive influence on the religious event which was about to transform the world. He devised the scenery and the technical terms of the new messianic faith; and we may apply to him what Jesus said of John the Baptist: "Before him, the prophets; after him, the kingdom of God." A few years later, the same ideas were reproduced under the name of the patriarch Enoch.[2] Essenism, which seems to have been

[1] *Vendidad*, xix. 18, 19; *Minokhired*, a passage published in the *Zeitschr. der deutsch. morgenländ. Gesellschaft*, i. 263; *Boundehesch*, xxxi. The lack of accurate chronology for the Zend and Pehlevi texts leaves much that is obscure upon these relations between Persian and Jewish beliefs.

[2] See Introduction, p. 42; also Hist. of the People of Israel, v. 20, note.

in direct relation with the apocalyptic school, sprang up about the same time,[1] and offered (as it were) a first rough sketch of the grand discipline which was soon to be established for the education of humanity.

It must not, however, be supposed that this movement, so profoundly religious and impassioned, had particular dogmas to give it impulse, as has been the case in all the conflicts that have broken out in the bosom of Christianity. The Jew of this time was as little as possible of a theologian. He did not speculate upon the essence of the Divinity; beliefs about angels, about the end of man, about the Divine *hypostases*, the first germs of which might already be perceived, were quite optional: they were meditations, which each one cherished according to the turn of his mind, but which a great number of men had never heard of. It was so even with the most orthodox, who did not share in these particular imaginings, and who adhered to the simplicity of the Mosaic law. No dogmatic power, like that which orthodox Christianity has bestowed upon the Church, then existed. It was not until the end of the third century, when Christianity had fallen into the hands of reasoning races wild with logic and metaphysics, that that fever for definitions began which made the history of the Church the history of a vast controversy. There were disputes also among the Jews; some ardent schools gave opposite solutions to almost every disputed question; but in these contests, the chief points of which are preserved in the Talmud, there is not a single word of speculative theology. Obey and keep the Law, because the Law is just, and because in

[1] The first distinct mention of the Essenes is found about 106 B.C. in Josephus, *Antiq.* XIII. xi. 2; *Wars*, I. iii. 5.

keeping it there is great reward, — this was the whole of Judaism. There is here no creed, no theoretical symbol. A disciple of the boldest Arabic philosophy, Moses Maimonides, succeeded in becoming the oracle of the synagogue, because he was a well-trained canonist.

The reigns of the last Asmoneans and that of Herod saw the excitement grow still stronger. They were filled with an uninterrupted series of religious movements. In proportion as power became secularised and passed into the hands of unbelievers, the Jewish people lived less and less for the earth, and allowed themselves to be more and more absorbed by the strange task which was being wrought among them. The world, distracted by other spectacles, knew nothing of what was going on in this forgotten corner of the East. Minds in touch with their age were, however, better informed. The tender and prescient Virgil seems to respond, as by a secret echo, to the second Isaiah; the birth of a child throws him into dreams of a universal new birth.[1] These dreams were common, and formed a class of literature included under the name "Sibylline." The quite recent formation of the Empire exalted the imagination; the great era of peace just commencing, and that impression of melancholy sensibility which souls experience after long periods of revolution, gave rise everywhere to boundless hopes.

In Judæa expectation was at its zenith. Holy persons — such as old Simeon, who, legend tells us, held Jesus in his arms; Anna, daughter of Phanuel, regarded

[1] Eclogue iv. The "Cumæan Song" (v. 4) was a sort of Sibylline apocalypse, stamped with the philosophy of history familiar to the East. See Servius on this verse, and the *Carmina Sibyllina*, iii. 97–817. (Cf. Tac. *Hist.* v. 13; Suet. *Vesp.* 4; Josephus, *Wars*, VI. v. 4.)

as a prophetess (Luke ii. 25) — passed their life about the temple, fasting, and praying that it might please God not to withdraw them from the world till he had shown them the fulfilment of the hopes of Israel. We are conscious of a brooding life, the approach of something unknown.

This confused mixture of clear views and of dreams, this alternation of deceptions and hopes, these aspirations ceaselessly driven back by an odious reality, found at last their expression in the incomparable man to whom the universal conscience has decreed the title "Son of God," — most justly, since he has given to religion a direction which no other is or probably ever will be able to emulate.

CHAPTER II.

CHILDHOOD.

Jesus was born at Nazareth,[1] a small town of Galilee, which until his time had no celebrity.[2] During the whole of his life he was designated by the name of "the Nazarene,"[3] and only by a very confused inference is it made out in the legend constructed about him that he was born at Bethlehem.[4] We shall see later on (chap. xv.) the motive for this supposition, and how it was the necessary consequence of the messianic char-

[1] Matt. xiii. 54–57; Mark vi. 1–4; John i. 45, 46.

[2] It is not mentioned in the Old Testament, Josephus, or the Talmud; but the name occurs in the liturgy of Kalir, for the ninth of Ab.

[3] Matt. xxvi. 71. Mark i. 24; xiv. 67. Luke xviii. 37; xxiv. 19. John xix. 19. Acts ii. 22; iii. 6; x. 38 (cf. John vii. 41, 42. Acts iv. 10; vi. 14; xxii. 8; xxvi. 9). Hence the name "Nazarenes" (Acts xxiv. 5), long given to the Christians by the Jews, and still denoting them in all Mussulman countries.

[4] A circumstance invented to correspond with Micah v. i. The "taxing" (enrolment) made by Cyrenius (Quirinius), with which the journey to Bethlehem is connected, was at least ten years later than the date of Jesus' birth according to Matthew and Luke. In fact, these two evangelists place his birth during the reign of Herod (Matt. ii. 1, 19, 22; Luke i. 5). Now, the census of Quirinius did not take place till after the deposal of Archelaus, — that is, ten years after Herod's death, and in the thirty-seventh after the battle of Actium (Jos. *Antiq.* XVII. xiii. 5; XVIII. i. 1, ii. 1). The inscription by which it was formerly thought to be made out that Quirinius made two enrolments is acknowledged to be spurious (see Orelli, *Inscr. Lat.* No. 623, with Henzen's supplement; Borghesi, *Fasti consulares*, unedited, under the year 742). Quirinius may have been twice *Legatus* of Syria; but the registration took place only in his second term (Mommsen, *Res gestæ divi Augusti*, Berlin, 1865, p. 11

acter attributed to him.[1] The precise date of his birth is not known. It took place during the reign of Augustus, probably about the year 750 from the founding of Rome;[2] that is, some years before the first of that era which all civilised nations reckon from the day on which he is believed to have been born.[3]

The name "Jesus," which was given him, is a modification from "Joshua." It was a very common name;

et seq.). The "taxing," at all events, would have applied to the regions made into a Roman province, not to kingdoms and tetrarchies, above all in the lifetime of Herod the Great. The texts by which it is sought to prove that some of the operations of statistics and registry ordered by Augustus extended to the dominion of the Herods, either imply nothing of the sort, or are the work of Christian writers who have taken this item from Luke's Gospel. What further clearly proves that the journey of the family of Joseph to Bethlehem is no way historical, is its assigned motive. Jesus was not of the family of David (see below, pp. 253–255); and even if he were, it could not be supposed that his parents would be compelled, for a mere official formality, to go and register themselves in a place which their ancestors had left a thousand years before. In forcing on them such an obligation, the Roman authority would have fostered pretensions very threatening to itself.

[1] Matt. ii. 1–6; Luke ii. 1–5. That this account is lacking in Mark, with the two parallel passages (Matt. xiii. 54; Mark vi. 1) in which Nazareth appears as the "own country" of Jesus, proves that no such legend belonged to the earliest text that gave the outline of the narrative as now found in Matthew and Mark. In view of the oft-repeated objections, there were prefixed to Matthew's Gospel certain qualified statements not so flagrantly contradicting the rest of the story as to compel the alteration of passages composed from quite another point of view. Luke, on the contrary (iv. 16), writing with deliberation, has for consistency's sake softened his expression. The fourth evangelist knows nothing of the journey to Bethlehem: for him, Jesus is simply "of Nazareth" (John i. 46), or "from Galilee" (ibid. vii. 41), on two occasions when it would have been of the highest value to recall his birth at Bethlehem.

[2] Matt. ii. 1, 19, 22; Luke i. 5. Herod died early in the year of Rome 750, corresponding with B.C. 4.

[3] The calculation serving as the basis of the vulgar era (it is well known) was made by Dionysius Exiguus in the sixth century. It implies certain data purely hypothetical.

but people naturally sought later on to discover some mystery in it, and an allusion to his character of Saviour.[1] Perhaps Jesus himself, like all mystics, was impressed by this signification. More than one great vocation in history has been occasioned by the name given to a child without any such afterthought. Ardent natures never can bring themselves to admit chance in anything that concerns them. For them everything has been divinely ordained; and they see a sign of the supreme will in the most insignificant circumstance.

The population of Galilee, as the name itself indicates,[2] was very mixed. This province reckoned among its inhabitants, in the time of Jesus, many who were not Jews, — Phœnicians, Syrians, Arabs, and even Greeks.[3] Conversions to Judaism were not rare in mixed countries like this. It is therefore impossible to raise any question of race here, or to investigate what blood flowed in the veins of him who has most of all contributed to efface the distinctions of blood in humanity.

Jesus sprang from the ranks of the people.[4] His father Joseph and his mother Mary were of humble station, living by their toil,[5] workpeople in that condition, so common in the East, which is neither ease nor poverty. The extreme simplicity of life in such countries, by dispensing with the need of modern com-

[1] Matt. i. 21; Luke i. 31.

[2] *Gelil haggoyim*, "circle of the Gentiles."

[3] Strabo, xvi. 2, 35. Josephus, *Life*, 12.

[4] The source of the genealogies designed to trace his descent from David will be explained below (chap. xv.). The Ebionites consistently suppressed these genealogies (Epiphanius, *Adv. hær.* xxx. 14).

[5] Matt. xiii. 55; Mark vi. 3; John vi. 42.

forts, renders the privileges of the wealthy almost valueless, and makes every one voluntarily poor. On the other hand, the total absence of taste for art and for whatever tends to the elegance of material life gives a naked aspect to the house of one who otherwise wants for nothing. Except for something sordid and repellent which Islamism brought into all parts of the Holy Land, the town of Nazareth in the time of Jesus did not perhaps much differ from what it is to-day.[1] The streets where he played as a child we can see in the stony paths or in the little crossways which separate the cabins. The house of Joseph, no doubt, closely resembled those poor dwellings, lighted by the doorway, which serve at once as workshop, kitchen, and bedroom, having for furniture a mat, a few cushions on the floor, one or two earthen pots, and a painted chest.

The family, whether from one or several marriages, was pretty numerous. Jesus had brothers and sisters,[2] of whom he seems to have been the eldest.[3] All have remained obscure, for it appears that the four who are given as his brothers — of whom one at least, James,

[1] The rude aspect of the ruins that cover Palestine proves that the towns not rebuilt after the Roman manner were very ill built. The form of Syrian houses is so simple, and so imperatively required by the climate, that it never can have much changed.

[2] Matt. i. 25 (common reading); xii. 46–50; xiii. 55, 56. Mark iii. 31–35; vi. 3. Luke ii. 7; viii. 19–21. John ii. 12; vii. 3, 5, 10. Acts i. 14. Hegesippus (Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 20). The assertion that *ah* ("brother") has a wider sense in Hebrew than with us is wholly false: its meaning is identically the same. Abuse and metaphoric or mistaken use prove nothing. When a preacher calls his hearers "my brethren," do we infer that the word "brother" has no well-defined meaning? In the passages just cited, it is clear that the word has no figurative sense. Note especially Matt. xii. 46–50, which equally forbids the loose rendering "cousin."

[3] Matt. i. 25; Luke ii. 7. There are critical doubts on the text in Matthew, but not on that in Luke.

acquired great importance in the early years of the development of Christianity — were his first-cousins. Mary, in fact, had a sister also named Mary,[1] who married a certain Alpheus or Cleophas (these two names appear to designate the same person),[2] and was the mother of several sons who played a considerable part among the first disciples of Jesus. These cousins, who adhered to the young Master while his own brothers opposed him (John vii. 5), took the title "brothers of the Lord."[3] The real brothers of Jesus, as well as their mother, had no notoriety until after his death (Acts i. 14). Even then they do not appear to have equalled in importance their cousins, whose conversion had been more spontaneous, and whose characters seem to have had

[1] It is certainly a singular circumstance that these two sisters have the same name. There is probably some inaccuracy, arising from the habit of almost indiscriminately calling Galilean women "Mary."

[2] They are not etymologically the same. Ἀλφαῖος is a transcription of the Syro-Chaldaic name *Halphai*; κλωπᾶς, or κλεόπας, is a shortened form of κλεόπατρος. But one may have been artificially substituted for the other, — as "Joseph" is made *Hegesippus*, "Eliakim" *Alcimus*, etc.

[3] In fact, the four named (Matt. xiii. 55; Mark vi. 3) as "brothers" of Jesus — James, Joses (or Joseph), Simon, and Judas — are all, or nearly all, found as sons of Mary and Cleophas (Matt. xxvii. 56; Mark xv. 40, xvi. 1; Luke xxiv. 10; Gal. i. 19; Jas. i. 1; Jude 1; Euseb. *Chron.* A.U.C. 810; *H. E.* iii. 11, 22, 32, after Hegesippus; *Const. Apost.* vii. 46). The suggestion here proposed is the only relief to the great difficulty of supposing two sisters having each three or four sons with the same names; and of admitting that James and Simon, the first two bishops of Jerusalem, called "brothers of the Lord," were real brothers of Jesus, who began by opposing him, but were afterwards converted. The evangelist, hearing the sons of Cleophas called "brothers of the Lord," wrote their names by mistake in the passage (Matt. xiii. 55 = Mark vi. 3) instead of the unknown names of the real brothers. Thus we see how those called "brothers of the Lord" — James, for example — are so different in character from the real brothers of Jesus as indicated in John vii. 3-5. The expression "the Lord's brothers" evidently designated, in the primitive church, a sort of rank similar to the apostolic (see especially Gal. i. 19; 1 Cor. ix. 5).

more originality. Their names were so completely unknown, that, when the evangelist puts into the mouth of the men of Nazareth the enumeration of the brothers according to natural relationship, the names of the sons of Cleophas are the first that occur to him.

Jesus' sisters were married at Nazareth (Matt. xiii. 56; Mark vi. 3), and he spent there the first years of his youth. Nazareth was a small town situated in a hollow, opening broadly at the summit of the group of mountains which close the plain of Esdraëlon on the north. The population is now from three to four thousand, and it can never have varied much.[1] The cold is keen there in winter, and the climate very healthy. Nazareth, like all the small Jewish towns at this period, was a huddle of huts built without plan, and must have shown that withered and poor aspect offered by villages in Semitic countries. The houses, it would seem, did not differ much from those cubes of stone, without exterior or interior elegance, found to-day throughout the richest parts of the Lebanon, which yet, surrounded with vines and fig-trees, are always extremely pleasing. The neighbourhood, besides, is charming; and no place in the world was so well adapted for dreams of absolute happiness. Even to-day, Nazareth is a delightful abode, perhaps the only spot in Palestine where the soul feels a slight relief from the burden which oppresses it in the midst of that unparalleled desolation. The people are kindly and cheerful; the gardens fresh and green. Antoninus the Martyr, at the end of the sixth century, gives an enchanting picture of the fertility of the environs, which he compares with Paradise

[1] According to Josephus (*Wars*, III. iii. 2) the smallest Galilean town had at least 5000 inhabitants. This is doubtless exaggeration.

(*Itin.* 5). Some valleys on the western side fully bear out his description. The fountain, where once gathered the life and gaiety of the little town, is destroyed; its broken channels yield now only a turbid stream. But the beauty of the women who meet there in the evening — that beauty already remarked in the sixth century, which (says Antoninus) was looked upon as a gift of the Virgin Mary — is still most strikingly preserved. It is the Syrian type in all its grace, so full of languor. There is no doubt that Mary was there almost every day, and took her place, with her jar on her shoulder, in the file of her forgotten companions. Antoninus further remarks that the Jewish women, elsewhere disdainful of Christians, are here full of courtesy. Even at the present day, religious animosity is less pronounced at Nazareth than elsewhere.

The prospect from the town is limited; but if we ascend a little and reach the plateau, swept by a perpetual breeze, which overlooks the highest houses, the view is splendid. On the west are displayed the fine outlines of Carmel, terminated by an abrupt spur which seems to plunge into the sea. Next are spread out the double summit which dominates Megiddo; the mountains of the country of Shechem, with their holy places of the patriarchal age; the hills of Gilboa; the small picturesque group to which cling the graceful or terrible recollections of Shunem and of Endor; and Tabor, with its rounded form, which antiquity compared to a bosom. Through a gap between the mountains of Shunem and Tabor are seen the valley of the Jordan and the high plains of Peræa, which on the east side form a continuous line. On the north, the mountains of Safed, inclining toward the sea, conceal St. Jean d'Acre, but

reveal the outline of the Gulf of Khaïfa. Such was the horizon of Jesus. This enchanted circle, this cradle of the kingdom of God, made his picture of the world for years. Even his later life did not widen much from the limits familiar to his childhood. For yonder, to the north, on the flank of Hermon, a glimpse is almost caught of Cæsarea-Philippi, the farthest point he ever reached in the Gentile world; and southward, the more sombre aspect of those Samaritan hills foreshadows the dreariness of Judæa beyond, parched as by a scorching wind of desolation and death.

If the world, remaining Christian but with a better idea of the reverence due to the sources of its higher life, should ever wish to substitute authentic shrines for the mean and spurious fanes to which the piety of ruder ages clung, it will build its temple upon this hill of Nazareth. Here, at the spot where Christianity appeared, and at the centre of its founder's activity, should arise the great cathedral in which all Christians might worship. Here also, on the spot where sleep Joseph the carpenter and thousands of forgotten Nazarenes who never passed beyond the outskirts of their valley, would be a better station than any in the world for the philosopher to contemplate the course of human events, to console himself for the disappointments that befall our most cherished instincts, and to reassure himself as to the divine end which the world pursues through endless falterings, and in spite of the universal vanity.

CHAPTER III.

EARLY EDUCATION.

NATURE here, at once smiling and grand, was the whole education of Jesus. He learned to read and to write (John viii. 6), no doubt, according to the Eastern method, — which consists in putting into the child's hands a book, which he repeats rhythmically with his little schoolfellows, until he knows it by heart.[1] It is, however, doubtful whether he understood the Hebrew writings in their original tongue. His biographers make him quote them from translations in the Aramean language;[2] and his methods of interpretation, so far as we can make them out from his disciples, were much like those then current, which form the spirit of the Targums and the Midrashim.[3]

The schoolmaster in the small Jewish towns was the *hazzan*, or reader in the synagogues.[4] Jesus had little to do with the higher schools of the scribes or *sopherim* (Nazareth had perhaps nothing of them); and he had none of those titles which, in the eyes of the vulgar, confer the privileges of learning.[5] Still, it would be a great error to imagine that Jesus was what we call ignorant. School education among us draws a great

[1] Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, *Levi* 6.
[2] Matt. xxvii. 46; Mark xv. 34.
[3] Jewish translations and commentaries of the Old Testament books.
[4] Mishna, *Schabbath*, i. 3.
[5] Matt. xiii. 54; John vii. 15.

distinction, in respect of personal worth, between those who have received it and those who are without it. It was not so in the East, or, in general, in the good old days. The rude state in which one remains among us who has not passed through the schools (owing to our estranged and wholly individual life) is unknown in those societies where moral culture, and especially the general spirit of the time, is transmitted by incessant contact with men. The Arab, who has never had a teacher, is often, nevertheless, a very superior man; for the tent is a sort of academy always open, where, from meeting with well-educated people, a considerable intellectual and even literary activity springs up. Refinement of manners and acuteness of intellect have in the East nothing in common with what we call education. The men of the schools, on the contrary, pass for pedants and ill-trained. In this social state, ignorance, which among us at once degrades a man to a lower rank, is the very thing that favours a great and original career.

It is not likely that Jesus knew Greek. This language was but little diffused in Judæa beyond the classes that had a hand in the government, and the towns inhabited by pagans, like Cæsarea.[1] The mother tongue of Jesus was the Syriac dialect mixed with Hebrew, then spoken in Palestine.[2] There is still greater reason to conclude

[1] Mishna, *Schekalim*, iii. 2. Jerusalem Talmud, *Megilla*, halaca xi.; *Sota*, vii. 1. Babyl. Talmud, *Baba kama*, 83 *a*, *Megilla*, 8 *b et seq.*

[2] Matt. xxvii. 46. Mark iii. 17; v. 41; vii. 34; xiv. 36; xv. 34. The expression ἡ πάτριος φωνή in the writers of this time, always signifies the Semitic dialect spoken in Palestine (2 Macc. vii. 21, 27; xii. 37. Acts xxi. 37, 40; xxii. 2; xxvi. 14. Jos. *Antiq.* XVIII. vi. 10; XX. at the end; and *Wars*, Proœm. 1; V. vi. 3, ix. 2; VI. ii. 1. *C. Apion.* i. 9; *de Macc.* 12, 16). It will be shown, later on, that some of the documents serving

that he knew nothing of Greek culture. This culture was proscribed by the Palestinian doctors, who included in the same curse "the man who raises swine, and him who teaches his son the Greek learning." [1] At all events, it had not penetrated to little towns such as Nazareth. Notwithstanding the anathema of the doctors, some Jews, it is true, had already embraced the Hellenic culture. Not to mention the Jewish school of Egypt, in which the attempts to combine Hellenism and Judaism had been going on nearly two hundred years, a Jew, Nicolas of Damascus, had become at this very time one of the most distinguished, best informed, and most respected men of his age, while Josephus was soon to furnish another example of a Jew completely Grecianised. But Nicolas was a Jew only in blood; Josephus (*Antiq.* XX. xi. 2) declares that he was himself an exception among his contemporaries; and the whole schismatic school of Egypt was sundered from Jerusalem to such a degree that we do not find the least allusion to it either in the Talmud or in Jewish tradition. What we are sure of is that at Jerusalem itself Greek was very little studied; that Greek studies were considered to be dangerous, and even servile; that at best they were esteemed only as an elegant accomplishment for women.[2] The study of the Law stood alone as

as the groundwork of the Synoptic Gospels were written in this Semitic dialect. It was the same with several apocryphal writings (4 Macc. xvi. *ad calcem*). In short, the Christianity which sprang directly from the Galilean movement (Nazarene, Ebionite, etc.), which long subsisted in Batanæa and Hauran, employed a Semitic dialect (Euseb. *De Situ*, etc., s. v. Χωβᾶ. Epiph. *Adv. hær.* xxix. 7, 9; xxx. 3. Jerome, *In Matt.* xii. 13; *Dial. adv. Pelag.* iii. 2).

[1] Mishna, *Sanhedrin*, xi. 1. Babyl. Talmud, *Baba kama*, 82 *b*, 83 *a*; *Sota*, 49 *a*, *b*; *Menachoth*, 64 *b* (cf. 2 Macc. iv. 10).

[2] Jerusalem Talmud, *Peah*, i. 1.

"liberal," and worthy of a thoughtful man.[1] When questioned as to the hour when it would be right to teach children "Greek wisdom," a learned rabbi replied: "At the hour which is neither day nor night; for it is written of the Law, Thou shalt study it day and night."[2]

Neither directly nor indirectly, then, did any element of Greek teaching reach Jesus. He knew nothing outside of Judaism; his mind preserved that fresh simplicity which is always weakened by an extended and varied culture. In the very bosom of Judaism he remained a stranger to many efforts which were often parallel to his own. On the one hand, the asceticism of the Essenes or the Therapeutæ[3] seems to have had no direct influence upon him;[4] on the other, the fine essays upon religious philosophy composed by the Jewish school of Alexandria — of which his contemporary, Philo, was the ingenious interpreter — were unknown to him. The frequent resemblances observed between him and Philo, those fine maxims concerning the love of God, charity, and rest in God,[5] — in which the Gospels and the writings of the illustrious Alexandrian thinker are each (as it were) an echo of the other, — flow from the common tendencies inspired in all lofty minds by the needs of the time.

[1] Josephus, *Antiq.* l. c.; Origen, *Contra Celsum*, ii. 34.

[2] Jerus. Talmud, *Peah*, i. 1; Babyl. Talmud, *Menachoth*, 99 *b*.

[3] The *Therapeutæ* of Philo are a branch of the Essenes. The name, even, seems to be only a Greek translation of the word Ἐσσαῖοι, *asaya*, "healers"). See Philo, *De vita contempl.* 1; Josephus, *Wars*, II. viii. 6; Epiphan. *Adv. hær.* xxix. 4.

[4] The Essenes do not once appear in the early Christian writings.

[5] See, in particular, Philo's *Quis rerum divinarum hæres sit*, and *De Philanthropia*.

Happily for him, he was also ignorant of that strange scholasticism taught at Jerusalem, which was soon to form the Talmud. If some few Pharisees had already brought it into Galilee, Jesus did not associate with them; and when later he met this silly casuistry face to face, it only inspired him with disgust. We may believe, however, that the principles of Hillel were not unknown to him. This rabbi, fifty years before, had uttered aphorisms almost like his own. By his poverty so meekly borne, by the gentleness of his character, by his antagonism to priests and hypocrites, Hillel was the true master of Jesus,[1] if one may speak of a master in connection with so lofty an originality.

The reading of the Old Testament made a much profounder impression. The canon of the holy books was composed of two principal parts: the Law — that is to say, the Pentateuch — and the Prophets, such as we possess them now. Interpretation by way of allegory was applied wholesale to all these books, aiming to draw from them what is not in them, but what responded to the aspirations of the age. The Law — which represented not the ancient laws of the country, but social dreams, factitious codes, and pious frauds of the pietistic kings — had become, since the nation ceased to govern itself, an inexhaustible theme of subtile interpretations. As to the Prophets and the Psalms, the general persuasion was that almost all features in these books ever so little mysterious had reference to the Messiah; and it was sought to find in them the type of him who should realise the nation's hopes. Jesus shared the universal inclination to these allegorical expositions

[1] *Pirké Aboth*, i. ii. Jerus. Talmud, *Pesachim*, vi. 1. Babyl. Talmud, *Pesachim*, 66 *a*; *Schabbath*, 30 *b*, 31 *a*; *Joma*, 35 *b*.

But the true poetry of the Bible, hidden to the shallow interpreters at Jerusalem, was fully revealed to his fine genius. The Law seems not to have had much charm for him; he believed he could find something better. But the religious poetry of the Psalms proved to be in wonderful harmony with his own lyric soul; and these noble hymns remained, during his whole life, his nourishment and support. The Prophets were his true masters, especially Isaiah and his successor in the time of the Captivity, with their brilliant dreams of the future, their impetuous eloquence, and their invectives mingled with enchanting pictures. He doubtless read also many apocryphal works, — that is, those more recent writings, whose authors had borrowed the names of prophets and patriarchs in order to claim an authority no longer granted to any but the most ancient scriptures. The Book of Daniel impressed him above all others.[1] This book, composed by a Jewish zealot in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes and put forth under the name of an ancient sage,[2] summed up the spirit of these later days. Its author, the real creator of the philosophy of history, was the first who dared to see in the onward march of the world and the succession of empires only a process subordinated to the destinies of the Jewish people. Jesus was in early youth penetrated by these high hopes. Perhaps, too, he had read the visions of Enoch, then regarded with equal reverence as the holy books,[3] and the other writings of the same

[1] Matt. xxiv. 15; Mark xiii. 14.

[2] The legend of Daniel was already shaped in the seventh century B. C. (Ezek. xiv. 14, 20; xxvii. 3). It was afterward supposed that he had lived at the time of the Captivity in Babylon.

[3] Jude 6, 14; 2 Pet. ii. 4, 11; Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs (Simeon 5; Levi 10, 14, 16; Judah 18; Zeb. 3; Dan 5; Benj. 9; Naphtali 4); Ep.

class, which kept up so great commotion in the popular mind. The advent of the Messiah, with its glories and terrors, — nations falling to pieces one after another, the dire convulsion of sky and earth, — made the familiar food of his imagination; and as these revolutions were believed to be close at hand, as numbers of people sought to calculate their date, the supernatural realm into which we are lifted by such visions appeared to him from the first quite natural and simple.

That Jesus had no acquaintance with the general condition of the world is seen in every feature of his more authentic discourses. The earth to him appears as still divided into kingdoms making war upon one another; he seems to ignore the "Roman peace" and the new social state which his own time was bringing to pass. He had no clear notion of the Roman power; the name of "Cæsar" alone had reached him. He saw the growth of cities in Galilee or its neighbourhood, — Tiberias, Julias, Diocæsarea, Cæsarea, — splendid works of the Herods, who sought by these magnificent structures to prove their admiration for Roman civilisation, and their devotion to the members of the family of Augustus; places whose names, strangely altered, now serve by a caprice of fate to designate miserable hamlets of Bedouins. He probably also saw Sebaste, a work of Herod the Great, a showy city, whose ruins would make one believe that it had been brought there ready made, like a machine that had only to be set up in its place.

Barn. 4, 16 (cod. Sinait.; see Introd. pp. 41, 42). The Book of Enoch still forms part of the Ethiopic Bible. As we know it in the Ethiopic version, it is composed of portions of various dates. [See *Hist. of Israel*, v. 20, n.] Several have a likeness to the discourses of Jesus (cf. chaps. xcvi.–xcix. with Luke vi. 24–26).

This ostentatious style of architecture, which came to Judæa in shiploads; the hundreds of columns, all of the same diameter, the ornament of some insipid Rue de Rivoli, — these were what he called "the kingdoms of the world and all the glory of them." But this luxury of power, this administrative and official art, displeased him. What he really loved were his Galilean villages, — a confusion of huts, threshing-floors, wine-presses cut in the rock, wells, tombs, orchards of figs and olives. He always clung close to Nature. Courts of kings were in his thought places where men wear fine clothes (Matt. xi. 8). The charming incongruities which appear in his parables when he brings kings and mighty ones on the stage [1] prove that he never had any conception of aristocratic society, except as a young villager who sees the world through the prism of his own simplicity.

Still less did Jesus comprehend the new idea created by Grecian science, the basis of all philosophy, amply confirmed by modern science, — the exclusion of supernatural powers, to which the simple faith of ancient times attributed the government of the universe. Almost a century before him, Lucretius had admirably expressed the unchanging order of the general system of Nature. The negation of miracle — the idea that everything in the world comes to pass by laws in which the personal intervention of superior beings has no share — was universally admitted in the great schools of all countries that had accepted Grecian science. Perhaps even Babylon and Persia were not strangers to it. Jesus knew nothing whatever of this movement. Although born at a time when the principle of positive

[1] See, for example, Matt. xxii. 2–14.

science was already proclaimed, he lived wholly in the supernatural. Never, perhaps, had the Jews been more possessed with the thirst for the marvellous. Philo, who lived in a great intellectual centre, and had received a very complete education, has only a science of guesswork, very poor in quality.

On this point Jesus differed in no respect from his countrymen. He believed in the Devil, whom he regarded as a kind of evil genius (Matt. vi. 13), and imagined, like everybody else, that nervous maladies were produced by demons who seized upon the patient and agitated him. To him the marvellous was not the exceptional, it was the normal state. Our idea of the supernatural, with its impossibilities, does not appear until the experimental knowledge of Nature is fully come to birth. The man who is a stranger to all idea of physical law — who believes that by prayer he can alter the path of the clouds, can arrest disease and even death — finds nothing extraordinary in miracle, inasmuch as to him the whole course of things proceeds from free volitions of the Divinity. This intellectual condition was always that of Jesus. But in his great soul such a belief produced effects quite opposite to those wrought on the vulgar. With these, faith in the special action of God led to a silly credulity, and to the tricks of charlatans. With him it belonged to a profound apprehension of the familiar relations of man with God, and to an exaggerated belief in the power of man, — noble errors, which were the secret of his power; for, if in course of time they were sure to put him at fault in the view of the physicist and chemist, they gave him a power over his own age which no individual has ever exerted before or since.

At a very early age his exceptional character began to reveal itself. Legend delights to show him, even as a child, in revolt against parental authority, and deviating from the common path to follow his vocation.[1] It is at least certain that for the relations of kinship he cared little. His family do not seem to have loved him;[2] and more than once we find him harsh toward them.[3] Jesus, like all men exclusively preoccupied by an idea, came to think little of the ties of blood. It is the bond of thought alone which natures like his recognise. "Behold my mother and my brethren," said he, extending his hand toward his disciples; "whoever does the will of my Father, that one is my brother and sister." Plain people did not understand this view of things; and one day a woman who was passing near him cried out, "Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the breast which thou hast sucked!" But he replied, "Yea, rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it!" (Luke xi. 27, 28). Soon, in his daring revolt against Nature, he went still further: we shall see him trampling under foot everything that is human, — blood, love, country, — and retaining mind or heart only for the idea which came to him in the guise of absolute goodness and truth.

[1] Luke ii. 42–50. The apocryphal Gospels are full of similar tales, carried to the grotesque.

[2] Matt. xiii. 57; Mark vi. 4; John vii. 3–5. See below, p. 190, note 7.

[3] Matt. xii. 48; Mark iii. 33; Luke viii. 21; John ii. 4: Gospel of Hebrews, in Jerome, *Dial. adv. Pelag.* iii. 2.

CHAPTER IV.

MENTAL DEVELOPMENT.

As the cooled earth no longer permits us to comprehend the phenomena of primitive creation, because the fires that once penetrated it are extinct, so studied explanations are always inadequate when the question is how to apply our timid methods of analysis to the revolutions of those creative epochs on which the destiny of humanity has turned. Jesus lived at one of those periods when the game of public life is freely played, when the stake men play for is increased a hundredfold. Every great career at such a time is sure to end in violent death; for these movements imply a freedom of action and an absence of forethought such that they cannot go on without meeting terrible counter-shocks. In the present day, man risks little and gains little. In heroic periods of human activity, man risks all and gains all. The good and the bad — at least, those who think themselves good or are thought to be bad — form opposing armies. The hero is transfigured by the scaffold. Characters have features sharply marked, which engrave them as eternal types in the memory of men. Excepting the French Revolution, no historical era was ever so well fitted as that in which Jesus grew up for developing those hidden forces which humanity holds as in reserve, undisclosed except in its days of excitement and peril.

If the government of the world were a speculative problem, and the greatest philosopher were the man best fitted to tell his fellows what they ought to believe, those great moral and dogmatic schemes of life which we call religions would proceed from calmness and reflection. But it is nothing of the kind. If we except Sakya-Muni, the great religious founders have not been metaphysicians. Buddhism itself, which (it is true) proceeded from pure thought, has won half of Asia to motives wholly political and moral. As for the Semitic religions, they are as little philosophical as possible. Moses and Mahomet were not speculative thinkers; they were men of action. It is by summoning to action men of their own race and time that they have been masters of mankind. Jesus, in like manner, was not a theologian or philosopher, having a more or less well-constructed scheme of doctrine. To be his disciple, it was not necessary to sign any formulary, or to repeat any confession of faith: one thing only was necessary, — to cleave to him, to love him. He never disputed about God, for he felt Him directly in himself. The reef of metaphysical subtilties, on which Christianity struck in the third century, was in no wise put there by the founder. Jesus had neither dogma nor system; he had a fixed personal resolution, which, exceeding in intensity every other created will, guides to this hour the destinies of humanity.

The Jewish people have had the advantage, from the Babylonian captivity down to the Middle Age, of being always in a state of extreme tension. This is why the interpreters of the spirit of the nation during this long period seem to write under the action of a violent fever, which puts them now above reason and now below it,

rarely in its level midway. Never had man seized the problem of the future and of his own destiny with a more desperate courage, or with more determination to go through to the end. Not conceiving the fate of humanity apart from that of their little race, Jewish thinkers were the first who concerned themselves about a general theory of the progress of our species. Greece, always confined within itself, and caring only for its petty provincial quarrels, had admirable historians. Stoicism announced the loftiest maxims upon the duties of man considered as citizen of the world and member of a great brotherhood. But previous to the Roman period we should vainly seek in classic literature for a general system of historical philosophy embracing all mankind. The Jew, on the contrary, thanks to a sort of prophetic sense which at moments makes the Semitic genius marvellously keen to see the future in large outline, has made history enter into religion. Possibly he owes a little of this spirit to Persia, which from an ancient date conceived the world-history as a series of evolutions, each presided over by its own prophet. Each prophet has his reign (*hazar*) of a thousand years; and out of these successive ages — analogous to the millions of ages assigned to each Hindoo Buddha — is woven the woof of events which prepare the way for the reign of Ormuzd. At the end of time, when the circle of millenniums (*chiliads*) shall be completed, the perfect Paradise will appear. Men will then live happily. The earth will be like a great plain; there will be only one language, one law, and one government for all men. But this advent will be preceded by terrible calamities. Dahak (the Persian Satan) will break his chains and hurl himself upon the world. Two prophets will then

come to console mankind, and to prepare for the advancing dispensation.[1]

Such ideas ran through the world, and penetrated as far as Rome, where they inspired a cycle of prophetic poems, whose fundamental ideas were the division of the history of humanity into periods, a succession of gods corresponding to these periods, a complete renewal of the world, and the final coming of a Golden Age.[2] The Book of Daniel, certain parts of the Book of Enoch, and the Sibylline books[3] are the Jewish expression of the same theory. No doubt these thoughts were far from being universal. They were at first embraced only by a few persons of vivid imagination, easily inclined to strange doctrines. The dry and narrow author of the Book of Esther never thinks of the rest of the world except to despise it and to wish it evil.[4] The disillusioned Epicurean who writes Ecclesiastes thinks so little of the future that he considers it even useless to work for his children: in the eyes of this pampered celibate, the final counsel of wisdom is to find one's chief good in squandered money.[5] But great things in any people are generally done by a minority. With all its monstrous faults, — hard, self-seeking, scoffing, cruel, narrow, subtle, sophistical, — the Jewish race is yet the source of the noblest movement of disinterested

[1] *Yaçna*, xii. 24. Theopompus in Plutarch, *Of Isis and Osiris*, § 47. *Minokhired*, passage published in the *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, i. 163.

[2] Virgil, Ecl. iv. 4, with the commentary of Servius. Nogidius, cited by Servius on verse 10.

[3] *Carm. Sibyll.* iii. 97–817. [*Hist. of Israel*, v. 74–86.]

[4] Esther vi. 13; vii. 10; viii. 7, 11-17; ix. 1–22. Comp. the apocryphal ix. 10, 11; xiv. 13 *et seq.*; xvi. 20–24. [*Hist. of Israel*, iv. 140.]

[5] Eccl. i. 11; ii. 16, 18–24; iii. 19–22; iv. 8, 15, 16; v. 17, 18; vi. 3, 6; viii. 15; ix. 9, 10. [*Hist. of Israel*, v. 137–162.]

enthusiasm known in history. Opposition always makes the glory of a country. The greatest men of a nation are often those whom it puts to death. Socrates was the glory of Athens, which could not endure to live with him. Spinoza was the greatest of modern Jews, and the synagogue expelled him with disgrace. Jesus was the glory of the people of Israel, and they crucified him.

A gigantic dream had for centuries haunted the Jewish people, constantly reviving its youth in its decrepitude. A stranger to the theory of individual recompense which Greece had diffused under the phrase "immortality of the soul," Judæa had concentrated on her national future all her power of love and longing. She believed herself to possess divine promises of a boundless future; and as these aspirations were brutally crushed under the bitter reality which from the ninth century before our era gave the world over more and more to the domination of physical force, she fell back on the most impossible combinations of ideas, and attempted the strangest evolutions. Before the Captivity, when all the earthly future of the nation disappeared in the secession of the northern tribes, they had dreamed of restoring the house of David, reconciling the two divisions of the people, the triumph of theocracy and Jehovah-worship over idolatrous beliefs. At the time of the Captivity, a poet full of harmony foresaw the splendour of a future Jerusalem, to which distant isles and nations should be tributary, under colours so charming that it was as if a glance from the eyes of Jesus had reached him from a distance of six centuries.[1]

The victory of Cyrus seemed for a time to realise

[1] See the last six chapters of Isaiah, lx.–lxv.

all that had been hoped for. The grave disciples of the Avesta and the adorers of Jehovah believed themselves brothers. Persia, in banishing the multiple divinities (*dévas*) and transforming them into demons (*divs*), had derived something like monotheism from the old Iranian fancies, which were in substance a play of natural imagery. In their prophetic tone many teachings of Iran greatly resemble certain compositions of Hosea and Isaiah. Under the successors of Cyrus[1] Israel had rest, and in the reign of Xerxes (Ahasuerus), we are told, made itself feared by the Iranians themselves. Then the triumphant and often savage advance of Greek and Roman civilisation upon Asia threw it back upon its dreams. More than ever it invoked the Messiah as the judge and avenger of the nations. It required a complete renovation — a revolution which should take the world by its roots and shake it from top to bottom — to satisfy the boundless longing for vengeance excited in Israel by the feeling of its own superiority and the sight of its humiliations.[2]

If Israel had possessed the so-called spiritual doctrine which divides man into two parts (body and soul) and finds it quite natural that while the body decays the soul survives, this paroxysm of rage and energetic protest would have had no motive. But such a doctrine, proceeding from Greek philosophy, was not in the traditions of the Jewish mind. The ancient Hebrew writings contain no trace of future rewards or punish-

[1] The Achæmenidæ. The whole Book of Esther breathes a strong attachment to this dynasty. Ecclesiastes, which seems to have been written at nearly the same time [about two centuries later, according to Renan's later judgment], shows great relaxation of Jewish thought.

[2] Apocr. Epistle of Baruch, in Fabricius (*Cod. pseud. V. T.* ii. 47) and Ceriani (*Monum. sacra et profana*, I. i. 96).

ments. While the idea of the solidarity of the tribe existed, it was natural that a strict retribution according to individual desert should not be thought of. So much the worse for the pious man who happened to live in a time of impiety; he suffered like the rest under the public misfortunes consequent on the general irreligion. This doctrine, bequeathed by the sages of the patriarchal era, fell every day into intolerable contradictions. Already at the time of Job it was much shaken; the old men of Teman who professed it were behind the age; and the young Elihu, who comes upon the stage to dispute with them, dares to utter at his first word the essentially revolutionary thought, that "wisdom is no longer with the old" (Job xxxii. 9). With the complications brought into the world since the time of Alexander, the old Temanite and Mosaic principle became still more intolerable.[1] Never had Israel been more faithful to the Law, and yet it had suffered the atrocious persecution of Antiochus. Only a declaimer, accustomed to repeat old phrases denuded of sense, had dared to assert that these evils proceeded from the unfaithfulness of the people.[2] What! these victims who die for their faith, — these heroic Maccabees, this mother with her seven sons, — will Jehovah forget them eternally; will he abandon them to the corruption of the grave? (2 Macc. vii.) A worldly and sceptic Sadducee might possibly not recoil before such a consequence. A consummate sage, like Antigonus of

[1] It is, however, remarkable that the son of Sirach holds strictly to this view (Ecclesiasticus xvii. 26–28; xxii. 10, 11; xxx. 4; xli. 1, 2; xliv. 9). The author of the Book of Wisdom is of a quite different opinion (i. 4 in the Greek).

[2] Esther (apocr.) xiv. 6, 7. Apocryphal epistle of Baruch (Fabricius and Ceriani as above).

Soco,[1] might indeed maintain that we must not practise virtue like a slave, in expectation of a recompense; that we must be virtuous without hope. But the mass of the nation could not content itself with that. Some, attaching themselves to the philosophical principle of immortality, imagined the righteous as living in the memory of God, glorious forever in the remembrance of men, judging the wicked who had persecuted them.[2] "They live in the sight of God; . . . they are known of God" (Wisd. iv. 1), — that was their reward. Others, especially the Pharisees, had recourse to the doctrine of the resurrection:[3] the righteous would live again to participate in the messianic reign; they would live again in the flesh, and in sight of a world of which they will be kings and judges; they would witness as spectators the triumph of their ideas and the humiliation of their enemies.

We find among the ancient people of Israel only the faintest traces of this fundamental dogma. The Sadducee, who did not believe it, was in reality faithful to the old Jewish doctrine; it was the Pharisee, the believer in the resurrection, who was the innovator. But in religion it is always the zealous party that innovates, advances, and follows out the logic of faith. The resurrection (an idea totally different from the immortality

[1] *Pirké Aboth*, i. 3.

[2] Wisdom of Solomon ii.–vi., viii. 13; *Pirké Aboth*, iv. 16; *De rationis imperio* (ascribed to Josephus), 8, 13, 16, 18. It is further to be noticed that the author of this latter treatise puts personal reward only in the second rank as motive. The mainspring of the martyr's devotion is pure love of the Law, the benefit of his death to the people, and the glory that will attach to his name (Wisdom iv. 1 *et seq.* Eccles. xliv. *et seq.* Josephus, *Wars*, II. viii. 10; III. viii. 5).

[3] 2 Macc. vii. 9, 14; xii. 43, 44. [These passages refer to the martyrdom of the Seleucid period, — the mother and seven sons, etc.]

of the soul) followed very naturally from earlier doctrines and from the actual situation. Perhaps Persia also furnished some of its elements.[1] In any case, — combining with belief in the Messiah, and with the doctrine of a speedy renewal of all things, — the dogma of the resurrection formed the basis of those apocalyptic theories which, without being articles of faith (for the orthodox Sanhedrim of Jerusalem seems not to have adopted them), pervaded all imaginations, and excited a great ferment of opinion from one end of the Jewish world to the other. In the total absence of dogmatic rigour, very contradictory notions were admitted all at once, even on so primary a point. Here the righteous were to await the resurrection (John xi. 24), and there they were to be received at the moment of death into Abraham's bosom (Luke xvi. 22). Sometimes the resurrection was held to be general (Dan. xii. 2), or again it was to be reserved only for the faithful (2 Macc. vii. 14); with some it presupposed a new earth and a new Jerusalem, while with others it implied a previous destruction of the universe.

Jesus, from the moment he began to think, entered into the burning atmosphere created in Palestine by the ideas we have just referred to. These ideas were taught in no school; but they were in the air, and the young reformer's soul was early penetrated by them. Our hesitations and doubts never reached him. On that summit of the hill of Nazareth, where no man of the present day can sit without an uneasy sense of his own (perhaps worthless) destiny, Jesus sat again and again unvisited by doubt. Free from selfishness, the source of

[1] Theopompus in Diog. Laert. *proœm.* 9; *Boundehesch*, xxxi. Traces of the doctrine of resurrection in the *Avesta* are very doubtful.

our sorrows, which impels us to brood bitterly upon the rewards of virtue beyond the grave, he thought only of his work, his race, and humanity at large. Those mountains, that sea, that azure sky, those lofty plains in the horizon, were for him not the sad vision of a soul which questions Nature upon its fate, but the certain symbol, the transparent shadow, of an unseen world and a new heaven.

Jesus never attached much importance to the political events of his time, and was probably ill informed regarding them. The dynasty of the Herods lived in a world so different from his own, that he doubtless knew it only by name. Herod the Great died about the time when Jesus was born, leaving imperishable memories, monuments which must compel the most unfriendly judgment of posterity to associate his name with that of Solomon; yet his work was incomplete, and could not be continued. An ambitious worldling, lost in a maze of religious conflict, this crafty Idumæan had the advantage which one derives from coolness and good sense, devoid of morality, in the midst of passionate fanatics. But his conception of a secular kingdom of Israel, even had it not been an anachronism in the state of the world in which he held it, would have been wrecked, like the similar project of Solomon, upon the difficulties arising from the very character of the nation. His three sons were nothing but Roman lieutenants, like Indian rajahs under English rule. Antipater or Antipas, tetrarch of Galilee and Peræa, whose subject Jesus was all his life, was an idle and empty prince, a favourite and flatterer of Tiberius, and too often misled by the evil influence of his second wife Herodias.[1]

[1] Luke iii. 19. Josephus, *Antiq.* XVIII. v. 1; vii. 1, 2; — ii. 3; iv. 5; v. 1; — vii. 2.

Philip, tetrarch of Gaulonitis and Batanæa, into whose territories Jesus made frequent journeys, was a much better sovereign.[1] As to Archelaus, ethnarch of Jerusalem, Jesus could not have known him, being about ten years of age when this man, weak and characterless, though sometimes violent, was deposed by Augustus.[2] The last trace of independence was in this way lost to Jerusalem. United with Samaria and Idumæa, Judæa made a kind of annex to the province of Syria, in which the senator Publius Sulpicius Quirinius,[3] a well-known official of consular rank, was the imperial deputy. A series of Roman procurators, subordinate in all important matters to the imperial legate of Syria, — Coponius, Marcus Ambivius, Annius Rufus, Valerius Gratus, and lastly (in the twenty-sixth year of our era) Pontius Pilate, — followed one another,[4] and were incessantly occupied in smothering the volcano which threatened to explode beneath their feet.

Continual seditions, excited by the zealots of Mosaism, never ceased during this period to disturb Jerusalem.[5] To the seditious, death was certain; but death, when the integrity of the Law was at stake, was welcomed eagerly. To overthrow the Roman eagles; to destroy the works of art erected by the Herods, in which the Mosaic rules were not always respected;[6] to rebel

[1] Josephus, *Antiquities*, XVIII. iv. 6.

[2] Ibid., XVII. xii. 2; *Wars*, ii. 3.

[3] Orelli, *Inscr. Lat.* 3693. Henzen, *Suppl.* 7041. *Fasti Prænest.*, March 6, April 28 (*Corpus inscr. Lat.* i. 314, 317). Borghesi, *Fast. consul.* (unedited), A. U. 742. Mommsen, *Res gestæ divi Augusti*, 111. Tacitus, *Ann.* ii. 30; iii. 48. Strabo, XII. vi. 5.

[4] Josephus, *Antiquities*, XVIII.

[5] Ibid., the whole of books XVII. and XVIII.; *Wars*, I. and II.

[6] Id. *Antiquities*, XV. x. 4; *Wars*, I. xxxiii. 2, 3. Compare the Book of Enoch xcvii. 13, 14.

against the votive shields set up by the procurators, whose inscriptions seemed tainted by idolatry,[1] — were perpetual temptations to fanatics who had reached that degree of exaltation which takes away all care for life. Judas son of Sariphæus, and Matthias son of Margaloth, two celebrated doctors of the Law, thus formed a party of bold aggression against the established order, which continued after their execution.[2] The Samaritans were agitated by movements of the same kind.[3] The Law seems never to have counted more impassioned votaries than at the very moment when that man already lived, who, by the full authority of his genius and of his great soul, was about to do it away. The Zealots (*kanaïm*) or Sicarii — pious assassins, who imposed on themselves the task of killing whoever in their estimation broke the Law — began now to appear.[4] Representatives of a totally different spirit — miracle-mongers (*thaumaturgi*), considered as in some sense divine persons — found credence, under the imperious need which this age felt of the supernatural and divine.[5]

A movement which had much more influence on Jesus was that of Judas, the Gaulonite or Galilean. Of all the constraints to which countries newly conquered by Rome were subjected, the census was the most unpopular.[6] This measure, which always irritates nations little accustomed to the responsibilities of great

[1] Philo, *Leg. ad* Caium, 38.

[2] Josephus, *Antiquities*, XVII. vi. 2; *Wars*, I. xxxiii. 3 *et seq.*

[3] Id. *Antiq.*, XVIII. iv. 1, 2.

[4] Mishna, *Sanhedrin*, ix. 6. John xvi. 2. Josephus, *Wars*, IV. V.; VII. viii. ix.

[5] As Simon Magus, see Acts viii. 9–11.

[6] Disc. of Claudius at Lyons, tab. 2, s. f. De Boissieu, *Inscr. ant. de Lyon*, 136.

central administrations, was particularly hateful to the Jews. Already, under David, we see how a numbering of the people provoked violent resistance and threatenings of the Prophets (1 Sam. xxiv.). The census, in fact, was the basis of taxation. Now taxation, in the estimation of a pure theocracy, was almost an impiety. God being the sole master whom man ought to recognise, paying of tithes to a secular sovereign was, in a manner, putting him in the place of God. Completely ignorant of the idea of the State, the Jewish theocracy in this only drew the logical inference, — the negation of civil society and of all government. The money in the public chest was regarded as stolen.[1] The census ordered by Quirinius (A. D. 6) powerfully revived these ideas, and caused a violent ferment. A disturbance broke out in the northern provinces. One Judas, of the town of Gamala, on the eastern shore of the lake of Tiberias, and a Pharisee named Sadok, by denying the lawfulness of the impost, created a numerous party, which soon broke out into open revolt.[2] The fundamental maxims of this school were that liberty is more precious than life, and that no man ought to be called "master," since this title belongs to God alone. Judas had, doubtless, many other principles, which Josephus, always careful not to compromise his co-religionists, designedly suppresses; for we could not understand how for so simple an idea the Jewish historian gave him a place among the philosophers of his nation, and

[1] Babylonian Talmud, *Baba kama*, 113 *a*; *Schabbath*, 33 *b*.

[2] Josephus, *Antiquities*, XVIII. i. 1, 6; XX. v. 2. *Wars*, II. viii. 1; VII. viii. 1. Acts v. 37. In the Acts we find another agitator, Theudas, before Judas the Gaulonite; but this is an anachronism: the movement of Theudas took place A. D. 44 (Josephus, *Antiq.* XX. v. 1).

regarded him as the founder of a fourth school, side by side with those of the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes. Judas was evidently the chief of a Galilæan sect, imbued with messianic ideas which resulted in a political movement. The procurator, Coponius, crushed the sedition of the Gaulonite; but the school survived, and preserved its chiefs. Under the guidance of Menahem, son of its founder, and of one Eleazar his kinsman, we find it again very active in the last struggles of the Jews against the Romans.[1] Jesus, it may be, saw this Judas, who had a way of conceiving a Jewish revolution so different from his own; at all events, he knew his school, and it was probably by a reaction against his mistake that he pronounced the maxim upon the "penny" of Cæsar. Wisely standing aloof from all sedition, Jesus profited by the fault of his predecessor, and dreamed of another kingdom and another deliverance.

Galilee was thus a vast furnace, in which the most diverse elements were heating to a boiling point.[2] An extraordinary contempt of life, or (to speak more correctly) a kind of longing for death, was the result of these agitations.[3] Experience counts for nothing in great fanatical movements. In Algeria, during the early days of French occupation, there arose, each springtime, inspired men who declared that they were invulnerable, and were sent by God to expel the infidels; the following year their death was forgotten, and their successor found no less faith. Very stern on

[1] Josephus, *Antiquities*, XX. v. 2; *Wars*, II. xxii. 8, 9; VII. viii. ix.

[2] Luke xiii. 1. The Galilæan movement of Judas son of Hezekiah seems not to have had a religious aim; perhaps, however, this has been dissembled by Josephus (*Antiq.* XVII. x. 5).

[3] Josephus, *Antiquities*, XVI. vi. 2, 3; XVIII. i. 1.

the one hand, still the Roman power was not very meddlesome, and permitted much liberty. These great brute-force despotisms, terrible in repression, were not suspicious as those powers are which have a dogma to uphold. They allowed everything to be done up to the day when they thought they must use severity. In his wandering career, Jesus does not appear to have been once annoyed by the civil authorities. Such a liberty, and above all the good fortune which Galilee enjoyed in being much less restrained by the bonds of Pharisaic pedantry, gave to this province a real superiority over Jerusalem. The revolution — or, in other words, messianism — set all minds in a turmoil. Men believed that they were on the eve of beholding the great renewal; Scripture, tortured into a variety of meanings, became food for the most colossal hopes. In each line of the simple writings of the Old Testament they saw the assurance, and in a certain sense the programme, of the coming kingdom, which should bring peace to the righteous, and seal forever the work of God.

From all time this division into two parties, opposed in interest and spirit, had been for the Hebrew people a principle that had in it a mighty moral force. Every nation called to high destinies must form a complete little world, including within itself the opposite poles. Greece exhibited, a few leagues apart, Sparta and Athens, — to a superficial observer the two antipodes, but in reality rival sisters, each necessary to the other. It was the same with Judæa. Less brilliant in one sense than the development at Jerusalem, that of the north was on the whole equally fruitful; the most living works of the Jewish people have always proceeded thence. Complete absence of a feeling for Nature,

almost amounting to something dry, narrow, and even ferocious, has stamped upon all that Jerusalem alone effected a character grand indeed, but sad, arid, and repulsive. With its solemn doctors, its insipid canonists, its hypocritical and atrabilious devotees, Jerusalem could never have conquered humanity. The north has given to the world the simple Shulamite, the humble Canaanitish woman, the impassioned Magdalen, the good foster-father Joseph, and the Virgin Mary. It is the north alone which has made Christianity: Jerusalem, on the contrary, is the true home of that obstinate Judaism which, founded by the Pharisees and fixed by the Talmud, has traversed the Middle Age and come down to us.

A lovely natural landscape contributed to the formation of this spirit, less austere and less sharply monotheistic (if I may venture to call it so), which impressed all the dreams of Galilee with a charming and idyllic character. The region round about Jerusalem is, perhaps, the dreariest country in the world. Galilee, on the contrary, was extremely verdant, well shaded, smiling, the true home of the Song of Songs and the Canticles of the well-beloved.[1] During the two months of March and April the country is a carpet of flowers, incomparably fresh in colouring. The animals

[1] The shocking condition to which the country is now reduced, especially near Lake Tiberias, should not deceive us. These regions, now blasted, were once an earthly paradise. The baths of Tiberias, which are now a dreadful abode, were once the loveliest spot in Galilee (Josephus, *Antiquities*, XVIII. ii. 3). Josephus (*Wars*, III. x. 8) boasts of the fine trees of the plain of Gennesareth, where there is now not one left. Antoninus the martyr, about A. D. 600, — fifty years before the Moslem invasion, — still found Galilee covered with delightful plantations, and compares its fruitfulness with that of Egypt (*Itin.* 5). Compare Josephus, *Wars*, III. iii. 2.

here are small and extremely gentle: graceful and lively turtle-doves; blue-birds so light that they rest on a blade of grass without bending it; crested larks, which advance nearly under the very feet of the traveller; little brook-tortoises with soft bright eyes; storks with grave and modest mien, which, dismissing all timidity, allow themselves to be approached by man quite closely, and seem almost to invite his companionship. In no country in the world do the mountains spread themselves out with more harmony, or inspire loftier thoughts. Jesus seems to have specially loved them. The most important acts of his divine career took place on mountains. It was here that he was the most inspired;[1] here that he held secret communings with the ancient prophets; here that he showed himself transfigured before the eyes of his disciples.[2]

This lovely country — which at the present day has become, through the frightful impoverishment which Turkish Islamism has wrought on human life, so sad and painful, but where everything that man could not destroy breathes still of freedom, sweetness, and tenderness — overflowed with happiness and joy at the time of Jesus. The Galileans were reckoned brave, energetic, and industrious.[3] If we except Tiberias, built by Antipas in the Roman style,[4] in honour of Tiberius (about A. D. 15), Galilee had no large towns. The country was nevertheless very populous, covered with small towns and large villages, and cultivated with skill in every part.[5] By the ruins of its ancient splen-

[1] Matt. v. 1; xiv. 23. Luke vi. 12.

[2] Matt. xvii. 1–8; Mark ix. 1–8; Luke ix. 28–36.

[3] Josephus, *Wars*, III. iii. 2.

[4] Josephus, *Antiquities*, XVIII. ii. 2; *Wars*, II. ix. 1; *Life*, 12, 13, 64

[5] Josephus, *Wars*, III. iii. 2.

dour which survive we can trace an agricultural people in no way gifted in art, caring little for luxury, indifferent to the beauties of form, exclusively idealistic. The country abounded in fresh streams and fruits; the large farms were shaded with vines and fig-trees; the gardens were a mass of apple, walnut, and pomegranate trees.[1] The wine was excellent, if it may be judged from what the Jews still obtain at Safed, and they drank freely of it.[2] This contented and easily satisfied life was not at all like the sordid materialism of a French peasantry, or the coarse jollity of wealthy Normandy, or the heavy mirth of the Flemings. It expanded in mysterious dreams, in a kind of poetic mysticism, blending heaven and earth. Leave the austere Baptist in his desert of Judæa, to preach repentance, to inveigh unceasingly, and to feed on locusts in the company of jackals! Why should the companions of the bridegroom fast while the bridegroom is with them? Joy will be a part of the kingdom of God. Is she not the daughter of the humble in heart, of the men of good-will?

The entire history of infant Christianity has in this way come to be a delightful pastoral. A Messiah at the marriage supper, the harlot and the good Zacchæus called to his feasts, the founders of the kingdom of heaven like a bridal procession, — this is what Galilee has dared to offer, and what she has caused to be

[1] We may fancy them from several enclosures near Nazareth (cf. Cant. ii. 3, 5, 13; iv. 13; vi. 6, 10; vii. 8, 12; viii. 2, 5; Antoninus the martyr, as above). The aspect of the great farms is still well preserved in the southerly region of Tyre (old tribe of Asher). Traces of the ancient agriculture of Palestine, with its threshing-floors, press-rooms, silos, stalls, mills, etc., cut in the rock, appear at every step.

[2] Matt. ix. 17; xi. 19. Mark ii. 22. Luke v. 37; vii. 34. John ii. 3–10.

accepted. Greece has drawn admirable pictures of human life in sculpture and poetry, but always without receding backgrounds or distant horizons. Here are wanting the marble, the practised workmen, the exquisite and refined language. But Galilee has created for the popular imagination a far sublimer ideal; for behind its idyll the fate of humanity moves, and the light which illumines its picture is the sun of the kingdom of God.

Jesus lived and grew up under the quickening influence of these surroundings. From his infancy, he went almost every year to the feasts at Jerusalem (Luke ii. 41). The pilgrimage was for the provincial Jews a solemnity of sweet associations. Several entire series of psalms were devoted to celebrate the joy of thus journeying in family society (Luke ii. 42–44) during several days in springtime across the hills and valleys, all having in prospect the splendours of Jerusalem, the awe of the sacred courts, the delight of brethren dwelling together.[1] The route which Jesus usually followed in these journeys was that which is taken in the present day, through Ginæa and Shechem.[2] From Shechem to Jerusalem the way is very toilsome. But the neighbourhood of the old sanctuaries of Shiloh and Bethel, near which the pilgrim passes, keeps the mind awake. Ain-el-Haramié, the last halting-place,[3] is a melancholy and yet charming spot; and few impressions equal that

[1] See especially Psalms lxxxiv. cxxii. cxxxiii.

[2] Luke ix. 51-53; xxii. 11. John iv. 4. Josephus, *Antiquities*, XX. vi. 1; *Wars*, II. xii. 3; *Life*, 52. Pilgrims, however, often went by way of Peræa to avoid Samaria, where they might be in danger (Matt. xix. 1; Mark x. 1).

[3] According to Josephus (*Life*, 52) it was a three days' journey. But the stage from Shechem to Jerusalem must often have been divided.

which one feels when encamping there for the night. The valley is narrow and sombre, while a dark stream issues from the rocks, honeycombed with tombs, which form its banks. It is, I believe, "the valley of weeping," or of dripping waters, which is in song one of the stations on the way in the delightful eighty-fourth Psalm; and it became, to the sweet and sad mysticism of the Middle Age, an emblem of life. The next day, at an early hour, the traveller would be at Jerusalem; this expectation, even at the present day, sustains the caravan, rendering the night short and slumber light.

These journeys, during which the assembled nation exchanged its ideas, creating centres of great excitement in the capital every year, put Jesus in contact with the mind of his countrymen, and doubtless inspired him from his youth with a lively antipathy to the faults of the official representatives of Judaism. It is further implied that the desert was for him another school, and that he made long sojournings there (Luke iv. 42; v. 16). But the God he found there was not his God. It was at best the God of Job, severe and terrible, who gives account of himself to no man. Sometimes Satan came to tempt him. He would then return into his beloved Galilee, where he found again his heavenly Father, amidst the green hills and the clear fountains, among the crowds of women and children who, with joyous soul and the song of angels in their hearts, waited for the salvation of Israel.

CHAPTER V.

EARLIER TEACHINGS.

JOSEPH died before his son had assumed any public position. Mary accordingly remained the head of the family; and this explains why Jesus, when it was desired to distinguish him from others of the same name, was most frequently called "son of Mary."[1] It would seem that, having through her husband's death become friendless in Nazareth, she retired to Cana,[2] which was possibly her native place. Cana[3] was a little town about two or two and a half hours' journey from Nazareth, at the base of the hills which bound the plain of Asochis (*El-Buttauf*) on the north The prospect, less grand than that at Nazareth, extends over the whole plain, and is bounded in the most picturesque manner by the mountains of Nazareth and the hills of Sepphoris.

[1] This is the expression of Mark vi. 3 (cf. Matt. xiii. 55). Mark does not speak of Joseph: the Fourth Gospel and Luke, on the other hand, prefer the expression "son of Joseph" (Luke iii. 23; iv. 22. John i. 46; vi. 42). It is singular that the Fourth Gospel never calls the mother of Jesus by her name. The name "Ben-Joseph" in the Talmud, indicating one of the Messiahs, is suggestive.

[2] John ii. 11; iv. 46. John is the only writer who seems informed on this point.

[3] Now *Kana-el Djelil*, the same with *Cana Galilé* of the times of the Crusades (see *Archives des missions scientifiques*, ser. 2, vol. iii. p. 370). *Kefr Kenna*, an hour or hour and a half north-northeast from Nazareth (*Capharchemmé* of the Crusades) is distinct from this.

Jesus appears to have resided in this place for some time. Here he probably passed a part of his youth, and his first manifestations were made at Cana.[1] He followed the same occupation as his father, — that of a carpenter.[2] This was no humiliating or vexatious circumstance. The Jewish custom required that a man devoted to intellectual work should learn a handicraft. The most celebrated doctors had their trades:[3] thus Saint Paul, whose education was so elaborate, was a tent-maker, or weaver of carpets (Acts xviii. 3).

Jesus never married. All his power of loving was spent on what he considered his heavenly vocation. The extremely delicate sentiment which one observes in his manner towards women[4] did not interfere with the boundless devotion he cherished for his idea. Like Francis of Assisi and Francis de Sales, he treated as sisters the women who threw themselves into the same work with himself: he had his Santa Clara, and his Françoise de Chantals. However, it is probable that they loved him better than his work; he was certainly more beloved than loving. As happens frequently in the case of very lofty natures, his tenderness of heart grew to an infinite sweetness, a vague poetry, a universal charm. His relations — free and intimate, but purely moral in tone — with women of doubtful character are also explained by his devotion to his Father's glory, which made him jealously anxious for all beautiful creatures who could contribute to it.[5]

[1] John ii. 11; iv. 46. One or two of his disciples were from Cana (John xxi. 2; Matt. x. 4; Mark iii. 18).

[2] Matt. xiii. 55; Mark vi. 3; Justin, *Tryph.* 88.

[3] For example, R. Johanan the shoemaker; R. Isaac the blacksmith.

[4] See chap. ix., below.

[5] Luke vii. 37–50. John iv. 7–27; viii. 3–11.

What was the progress of thought in Jesus during this obscure period of his life? Through what meditations did he enter upon his prophetic career? We cannot tell, as the history comes to us in the shape of scattered narratives without exact chronology. But the development of living character is everywhere the same; and it cannot be doubted that the growth of a personality so powerful as that of Jesus followed very strict laws. An exalted conception of the Divinity — not due to Judaism, and seemingly the creation of his own great soul — was in a manner the germ of all his power. Here we must put aside the ideas familiar to us, and the discussions on which little minds spend themselves. Properly to understand the precise quality of his piety, we must forget all that has come between the Gospel and ourselves. Deism and Pantheism have been made the two poles of theology. Paltry academic discussions, Cartesian aridity of mind, the deep-rooted irreligion of the eighteenth century, contracting the thought of God, and limiting Him (so to speak) by excluding that which is not His very self, have stifled in the breast of modern rationalism all fruitful sense of the Divinity. If God, in fact, is a fixed entity outside of us, he who believes himself to have special relations with God is a "visionary;" and as the physical and physiological sciences have shown us that every supernatural vision is an illusion, the logical Deist finds it impossible to understand the great beliefs of the past. Pantheism, on the other hand, in suppressing the Divine personality, is as far as possible from the Living God of the ancient religions. Were the men who have best comprehended God — Sakya-Muni, Plato, Saint Paul, Saint Francis of Assisi, and Saint Augustine (at some

moments of his fluctuating life) — Deists or Pantheists? Such a question has no meaning. The physical and metaphysical proofs of the existence of God would have left these great men wholly unmoved. They felt the Divine within themselves.

We must place Jesus in the front rank of this great family of the true sons of God. Jesus has no visions; God does not speak to him as to one outside himself: God is in him. He feels himself close to God, and draws from his own heart all that he says of his Father. He lives in the bosom of God by contact at every moment; he sees Him not, but hears Him, without need of thunder or burning bush like Moses, or revealing tempest like Job, or oracle like the old Greek sages, or familiar genius like Socrates, or the angel Gabriel like Mahomet. The imagination and hallucination of a Saint Theresa, for example, pass for nothing here. The intoxication of the Sufi, who declares himself identical with God, is also quite another thing. Jesus never once utters the sacrilegious thought that he is himself God: he believes himself to be in direct communication with God; he believes himself to be a son of God. The highest consciousness of God that has existed in the bosom of humanity is that of Jesus.

We understand, on the other hand, that Jesus, setting out with such an attitude of soul, could never be a speculative philosopher like Sakya-Muni. Nothing is farther from scholastic theology than the Gospel.[1] The speculations of Greek teachers on the Divine essence

[1] The discourses which the Fourth Gospel puts into the mouth of Jesus contain the germ of such a theology; but, since they utterly contradict those of the Synoptics, which doubtless represent the primitive *Logia*, they must be taken as documents of apostolic history, not as incidents in his life.

proceed from an entirely different spirit. God conceived simply as Father, — this is the entire theology of Jesus. And this was not with him a theoretical principle, a doctrine more or less proved, which he sought to impress upon others. He did not argue with his disciples;[1] he demanded from them no effort of attention. He did not preach his opinions; he preached himself. Very great and very disinterested minds often exhibit, along with much elevation of character, a quality of perpetual self-regard and extreme personal susceptibility, which, in general, is peculiar to women.[2] Their conviction that God is in them, and occupies Himself perpetually with them, is so strong that they have no fear of obtruding themselves upon others: our reserve and our respect for others' opinion, which is a part of our weakness, could not belong to them. This overstrained personality is not egotism; for such men, possessed by their idea, give their lives heartily to seal their work. It is the identification of self with the object it has embraced, carried to the utmost limit. It is regarded as vainglory by those who see in the new manifestation only the personal phantasy of him who exhibits it; but it is the finger of God to those who see the result. In this the madman is close beside the man inspired; only the madman never succeeds. It has not yet been given to mental aberration to act seriously upon the progress of mankind.

Jesus, no doubt, did not reach at one step this high assertion of himself; but it is probable that, from the first, he looked on himself as standing with God in the

[1] See Matt. ix. 9, and other similar accounts.

[2] See, for example, John xxi. 15–17, — noting that this trait seems to have been exaggerated in the Fourth Gospel.

relation of a son to his father. Here lies his true originality: for this he owes nothing to his own people.[1] Neither the Jew nor the Mussulman has understood this delightful theology of love. The God of Jesus is not the despot of doom, who kills, damns, or saves us just as it pleases Him. The God of Jesus is our Father: we hear Him while listening to the light breath which cries within us "Father" (Gal. iv. 6). The God of Jesus is not the partial autocrat who has chosen Israel for His people, and protects them before and against all the world: He is the God of humanity. Jesus would not be a patriot like the Maccabees, or a theocrat like Judas the Gaulonite. Rising boldly above the prejudices of his nation, he would establish the universal Fatherhood of God. The Gaulonite maintained that it were better to die than to give the title "Master" to any other than God; Jesus allows any who will to take this title, but reserves for God a dearer name. Yielding a mildly disdainful respect to the powerful of the earth, who are to him the representatives of force, he establishes the supreme consolation, — recourse to the Father whom each one has in heaven, and the true kingdom of God which each one bears in his own heart.

The expression "kingdom of God," or "kingdom of heaven,"[2] was the favourite phrase by which Jesus described the revolution he was bringing into the world.[3]

[1] The lofty soul of Philo comes in touch here, as at many other points, with that of Jesus. *De confus. ling.*, 14; *De migr. Abrah.* 1; *De somniis*, ii. 41; *De agric. Noë*, 12; *De mutat. nominum*, 4.

[2] The word "heaven," in the rabbinical language of that day, is a synonym of the name "God," which was commonly avoided. See Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald. Talm. Rabb.*, under the word שמים, and Daniel iv. 22, 23 (cf. Matt. xxi. 25; Mark xi. 30, 31; Luke xv. 18, 21, and xx. 4, 5).

[3] This expression occurs constantly in the Synoptics, the Acts, and the

Like nearly all the terms relating to the Messiah, it came from the Book of Daniel. According to the author of that extraordinary book, the four profane empires destined to extinction are to be succeeded by a fifth empire, — that of the "saints," which will endure forever.[1] This reign of God upon earth naturally led to the most diverse interpretations. For many, it was the reign of the Messiah, or of a new David. In Jewish theology the "kingdom of God" is generally simple Judaism, true religion, monotheist worship, or piety.[2] Near the end of his life Jesus seems to have believed that it would be realised in a material form by a sudden renovation of the world; but this was, doubtless, not his first idea.[3] The admirable moral which he derives from the notion of the Father-God is not that of enthusiasts who believe the world to be nearly at an end, and who prepare themselves by asceticism for a chimerical catastrophe; it is that of a world which has lived and would live still. "The kingdom of God is among you,"[4] he said to those who curiously sought for visible signs of his coming. The realistic conception of the Divine advent was only a cloud, a transient error, which his death has made us forget. He who founded

Pauline epistles. That it appears only once in the Fourth Gospel (iii. 3, 5), is because the discourses here reported are far from representing the real speech of Jesus.

[1] Daniel ii. 44; vii. 13, 14, 22, 27. Apocal. of Baruch in Ceriani: *Monumenta sacra et profana*, i. 82 (fasc. 2).

[2] Mishna, *Berakoth*, ii. 1, 3. Jerusalem Talmud, *Berakoth*, ii. 2; *Kidduschin*, i. 2. Babylonian Talmud, *Berakoth*, 15 *a*; *Mekilta*, 42 *b*; *Siphra*, 17 *b*. The expression often occurs in the *Midraschim*.

[3] Matt. v. 10; vi. 10, 33; xi. 11; xii. 28; xviii. 4; xix. 12. Mark x. 14, 15; xii. 34. Luke xii. 31.

[4] The rendering "within you" is less accurate, though not remote from the thought of Jesus in this passage.

the true kingdom of God, the kingdom of the meek and the humble, was the Jesus of the earlier period,[1] of those pure and cloudless days when the voice of his Father re-echoed within his bosom in clearer tones. It was then for some few months — a year perhaps — that God truly dwelt on earth. The voice of the young carpenter acquired all at once an extraordinary sweetness. An infinite charm breathed from his person, and those who had hitherto seen him recognised him as the same no longer.[2] He had not as yet any disciples, and the group of persons which gathered round him was neither a sect nor a school; but there was already felt among them a common spirit, and an influence both sweet and penetrating. His winning character, and doubtless one of those exquisite faces[3] which sometimes appear in the Jewish race, created around him a magic circle (as it were), from which no one, among these kindly and fresh-minded people, could escape.

Paradise would, in fact, have been brought upon the earth if the ideas of the young Master had not far transcended that level of ordinary goodness above which it has been found hitherto impossible to lift the human race. The brotherhood of men as sons of God, and the moral consequences resulting from it, were traced with

[1] The impressive theory of the revelation of the Son of Man [in glory], first appears in the Synoptics just before the story of the Passion (Matt. xxiv. 30). The early discourses, especially in Matthew, are purely ethical.

[2] Matt. xiii. 54–58; Mark vi. 2–6; John vi. 42.

[3] The tradition that in Jesus there was "no form or comeliness" [Is. liii. 2] — see Justin, *Tryph.* 85, 88, 100; Clem. Alex. *Pædag.* iii. 1; *Strom.* vi. 17; Orig. *c. Cels.* vi. 75; Tertull. *De carne Christi*, 9, *adv. Jud.* 14 — arose from the wish to find realised in him an assumed messianic trait. No traditional portrait of him existed in the earliest centuries (see Augustine, *De Trin.* viii. 4, 5; Irenæus, *Adv. hær.* I. xxv. 6.)

exquisite feeling. Like all the rabbis of the period, Jesus little affected consecutive reasonings, but clothed his teaching in short aphorisms, impressive in form, though at times enigmatical and strange.[1] Some of these maxims came from the books of the Old Testament; while others were the thoughts of more modern sages, especially Antigonus of Soco, Jesus son of Sirach, and Hillel, which had reached him, not through learned study, but as oft-repeated proverbs. The synagogue was rich in very happily-expressed precepts, which formed a sort of current proverbial literature.[2] Jesus adopted most of this oral teaching, but imbued it with a superior spirit.[3] Generally transcending the duties laid down by the Law and the elders, he required perfection. All the virtues of humility, forgiveness, charity, renunciation, self-discipline, — virtues which have been called Christian with good reason, if by this it is meant that they were really preached by the Christ, — were found in germ in this primary demand. As to justice, he contented himself with repeating the well-known axiom, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them."[4] But this old

[1] The *Logia* of Matthew bring together many of these maxims in the form of long discourses; but their fragmentary character is perceptible at the joinings.

[2] Sentences of the Jewish doctors of the time are collected in the little book called *Pirké Aboth*.

[3] Coincidences will be indicated from time to time, as they may occur. It has sometimes been thought that, as the Talmud was compiled later than the Gospels, the Jewish editors may have borrowed from the Christian ethics. But this is untenable; for the maxims of the Talmud which correspond to passages of the Gospels are fixed in date by the names of the doctors to whom they are ascribed, thus disproving the notion of such borrowings.

[4] [Renan cites this maxim in the negative form attributed to Hillel: "What thou wouldst not that another should do to thee, do not thou to him."]

maxim, which still has a selfish tinge, did not satisfy him;[1] he carried it to excess: "Whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also; and if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also." "If thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee." "Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you, pray for them that persecute you." "Judge not, that ye be not judged." "Forgive, and ye shall be forgiven." "Be merciful, as your Father also is merciful." "It is more blessed to give than to receive." "Whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted."[2]

In regard to alms, pity, good works, kindness, desire for peace, and complete disinterestedness of heart, he had little to add to the teaching of the synagogue;[3] but he stamped it with an emphasis full of moral glow, and thus gave novelty to those aphorisms which had long been current. Moral instruction is not made up of principles more or less well-expressed. The poetry of the precept, which makes one love it, is more than the

[1] Matt. vii. 12; Luke vi. 31. This maxim may be found in the Book of Tobit, iv. 16. Hillel constantly appealed to it (Babyl. Talm., *Schabbath*, 31 *a*), and declared, like Jesus, that it was a summary of the Law.

[2] Matt. v. 39, 40; Luke vi. 29: cf. Lamentations iii. 30. — Matt. v. 29, 30, and xviii. 9; Mark ix. 46. — Matt. v. 44; Luke vi. 37: cf. Babylonian Talmud, *Schabbath*, 88 *b*; *Joma*, 23 *a*. — Matt. vii. 1; Luke vi. 37: cf. Babyl. Talm. *Kethuboth*, 105 *b*. — Luke vi. 37: cf. Levit. xix. 18; Prov. xx. 22; Eccles. xviii. 1–5. — Luke vi. 36; Siphré, 51 *b* (Sulzbach, 1802). — Repeated in Acts xx. 35. — Matt. xxiii. 12; Luke xiv. 11, and xviii. 14. Of like spirit are the sayings reported by Jerome from the "Gospel of the Hebrews" (*Comm. in Ephes.* v. 4; Ezek. xviii.; *adv. Pelagium*, iii. 2): cf. Babyl. Talm. *Erubin.* 13 *b*.

[3] Deut. xxiv. xxv. xxvi. *et seq.* Is. lviii. 7; Prov. xix. 17; *Pirké Aboth*, 1; Jerusalem Talmud, *Péah*, i. 4; Babylonian Talmud, *Schabbath*, 63 *a*, and *Baba kama*, 93 *a*.

precept itself, viewed as an abstract truth. Now, it cannot be denied that these maxims, borrowed by Jesus from his predecessors, produce quite a different effect in the Gospel from that in the ancient Law, the *Pirké Aboth*, or the Talmud. Neither the ancient Law nor the Talmud has conquered and changed the world. With little originality of its own, granting that one might re-construct it almost entire out of earlier maxims, the morality of the Gospel remains no less the loftiest creation of the human conscience, the noblest code of perfect life that any moralist has traced.

Jesus did not speak against the Mosaic law; but it is clear that he saw its insufficiency, and he let this be distinctly understood. He repeated constantly that more must be done than the ancient sages commanded (Matt. v. 20–45). He forbade the least harsh word; he prohibited divorce and the taking of oaths; he condemned revenge and usury; he held voluptuous desire to be as criminal as adultery; he demanded a universal forgiveness of injuries.[1] The motive on which he grounded these maxims of exalted charity was always the same: "That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven; for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good." "For if," he added, "ye love them that love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans do the same? And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more than others? even the heathen do as much as that. But do ye be perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect."[2]

[1] Matt. v. 22, 31, 32 (cf. Babylonian Talmud, *Sanhedrin*, 22 *a*), 33–37, 38–42 (less formally forbidden in Deut. xv. 7, 8, and allowed by custom, as in Luke vii. 41–43); xxvii. 28 (cf. Talmud, *Masséket Kalla:* ed. Fürth, 1793, 34 *b*); v. 23–26.

[2] Matt. v. 45–48: cf. Levit. xi. 44, and xix. 2; Ephes. v. 1, and Plato's ὁμοίωσις τῷ θεῷ.

A pure worship, a religion without priests or external observances, resting entirely on the feelings of the heart, the imitation of God,[1] and direct communion between the conscience and the Heavenly Father was the result of these principles. Jesus never shrank from this daring consistency, which made him, in the very centre of Judaism, a revolutionist of the first rank. Why should there be any intermediaries between man and his Father? As God looks only on the heart, of what use are these purifications, — these observances which relate only to the body?[2] Even tradition, a thing so sacred to the Jew, is nothing compared with pure feeling. The hypocrisy of the Pharisees, who in praying turned their heads to see if they were observed, who gave alms with ostentation, and put upon their garments marks by which they might be recognised as pious persons, — all these grimaces of false devotion repelled him. "They have their reward," said he; "but thou, when thou doest thine alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth, that thy alms may be in secret; and thy Father, who seeth in secret, shall reward thee openly.[3] And when thou prayest, be not like the hypocrites, who love to pray standing in the synagogues and at the corners of the streets, that they may be seen of men. No doubt, they will have their due reward. But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father who is in secret; and thy Father, who seeth in secret, shall hearken to thee. And when thou prayest, use

[1] Comp. Philo, *De migr. Abrah.* 23, 24; *De vita contempl.*, throughout.

[2] Matt. xv. 11–20; Mark vii. 5–8.

[3] Matt. vi. 1–4 (cf. Eccles. xvii. 18, and xxix. 15; Babyl. Talm. *Chagiga*, 5 *a*, and *Baba bathra*, 9 *b*).

not vain repetitions, as the heathen do; for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking. God thy Father knows what things thou needest before thou ask them of him" (Matt. vi. 5–8).

Jesus affected no outward sign of asceticism, contenting himself with prayer, or rather meditation, upon the mountains and in solitary places, where man has always sought God.[1] This lofty idea of the relations of man with God, of which so few minds, even after him, have been capable, is summed up in a prayer compiled from pious phrases already current among the Jews, which he taught his disciples:[2] "*Our Father, which art in heaven, hallowed be thy name; thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us. Lead us not into temptation; deliver us from the Evil One.*"[3] He insisted particularly upon the idea that the Heavenly Father knows better than we do what we need, and that we almost sin against him in asking him for this or that particular thing (Luke xi. 5–13).

Jesus did nothing more in this than to carry out the consequences of the great principles laid down by Judaism, whose meaning the official classes of the nation inclined more and more to despise. The Greek and Roman prayers were almost always soiled with egoïsm. Never had Pagan priest said to the faithful, "If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy

[1] Matt. xiv. 23. Luke iv. 42; v. 16; vi. 12.

[2] Matt. vi. 9–13; Luke xi. 2–4; cf. Babyl. Talm. *Berakoth*, 29 *b*, 30 *a*, especially the expression אבינו שבשמים.

[3] That is, the Evil Spirit. [See discussion in *Pirqé Aboth*: Cambridge (Eng.), Univ. Press, 1877, pp. 142–145.]

gift before the altar and go thy way; first be reconciled with thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift" (Matt. v. 23, 24). Alone in antiquity, the Jewish prophets, especially Isaiah, in their antipathy to the priesthood, had discerned the true nature of the worship which man owes to God. "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? I have enough of them: the fat of your rams revolts me; your incense is an abomination to me, for your hands are full of blood. Purify your thoughts; cease to do evil, learn to do well; seek righteousness, and then come."[1] In later times a few such doctors as Simeon the Just,[2] Jesus son of Sirach,[3] and Hillel[4] almost reached this point, and declared that the sum of the Law was righteousness. Philo, in the Judæo-Egyptian world, attained at the same time with Jesus ideas of a high moral sanctity, which led to a decreasing regard for the customs of the Law.[5] Shemaia and Abtalion more than once showed themselves very liberal casuists.[6] Rabbi Johanan, a little later, went so far as to place works of mercy above even the study of the Law.[7] Jesus alone, however, proclaimed this principle in an effective manner. Never has any man been less a priest than he, or a greater enemy of forms which stifle religion under the pretext of protecting it. In this way we are all his disciples and his successors; in this way he has laid the eternal foundation-stone of

[1] Isaiah i. 11–17; lviii. Hos. vi. 6; Mic. vi. 6–8; Mal. i. 10, 11.

[2] *Pirké Aboth*, i. 2. [3] Eccles. xxxv. 1 *et seq.*

[4] Jerusalem Talmud, *Pesachim*, vi. 1; Babylonian Talmud, *id.* 66 *a*, and *Schabbath*, 31 *a*.

[5] *Quod Deus immut.* 1, 2; *De Abrah.* 22; *Quis rer. div. hæres*, 13, 55, 58; *De Prof.* 7, 8; *Quod omnis probus liber*, and *De vita contemplativa*.

[6] Babyl. Talm. *Pesachim*, 67 *b*. [7] Jerus. Talm. *Péah*, i. 1.

true religion; and, if religion is the essential thing for humanity, by this he has merited the divine rank which men have awarded him. An absolutely new idea, the idea of a worship founded upon purity of heart and human brotherhood, made its entrance into the world through him, — an idea so lofty that the Christian Church could not fail in this to belie utterly the spirit of its founder; and even in our own day few are the minds that grasp it.

An exquisite feeling of nature furnished Jesus with expressive images at every turn. Sometimes a wonderful keenness, like what we call wit, put his aphorisms in sharp relief; at other times their vivacity consisted in the happy use of popular proverbs: "How wilt thou say to thy brother, Let me pull the mote out of thine eye; and, behold, a beam is in thine own eye? Thou hypocrite; first take out the beam out of thine own eye, and then thou shall see clearly to pull the mote out of thy brother's eye." [1]

These lessons, long hidden in the heart of the young Master, soon gathered round him a few disciples. The spirit of the age was in favour of small churches; it was the time of the Essenes and the Therapeutæ. Certain rabbis, each having his own distinctive teaching, — Shemaia, Abtalion, Hillel, Shammai, Judas the Gaulonite, Gamaliel, and many others whose maxims crowd the Talmud,[2] — appeared on all sides. They wrote very little: the Jewish doctors of that age did not make books; everything was done by conversation and public lessons, to which it was sought to give a form easily

[1] Matt. vii. 4, 5; Luke vi. 41, 42. Cf. Babyl. Talm. *Baba bathra*, 15 *b*; *Erachin*, 16 *b*.

[2] See especially *Pirké Aboth*, chap. i.

remembered.[1] The day when the youthful carpenter of Nazareth began openly to proclaim those maxims, for the most part already in circulation but destined through him to regenerate the world, marked therefore no very startling event. It was only one rabbi more (true, the most fascinating of them all), and around him a few young people, greedy to hear him and to search for the unknown. It takes time to compel men's attention. There were as yet no Christians, though true Christianity was already founded, and doubtless it has never been more perfect than at this first moment. Jesus added to it nothing that could last. What do I say? He risked its very life; for every idea, in order to prevail, must make sacrifices: we never come out of the battle of life unscathed.

To conceive the good, in fact, is not enough: the need is to make it succeed among men. To this end, less pure paths must be followed. No doubt, if the Gospel were confined to a few chapters of Matthew and Luke, it would be more perfect, and would not be open now to so many objections; but without miracles would it have converted the world? If Jesus had died at the period of his career which we have now reached, there would not have been in his life a single page that could wound us. But, although greater thus in the eyes of God, he would have remained unknown to men; he would have been lost in the crowd of great unknown souls, which are the best of all. The truth would not have been made public, and the world would not have profited by the immense moral superiority which the Father had bestowed upon him. Jesus the son of

[1] The Talmud, which sums up this body of teaching, hardly began to be put in writing earlier than the second Christian century.

Sirach, and Hillel had uttered aphorisms nearly as elevated as his own. Hillel, however, will never be reckoned as the true founder of Christianity. In morals, as in art, to say is nothing; to do is everything. The idea which lies hidden in a picture of Raphael is of small account; the picture alone is prized. Just so in morals, truth has no value until it has reached the stage of feeling; it attains its full value only when it is realised in the world as deed. Some men of commonplace morality have written most excellent maxims. Some men of exalted virtue, on the other hand, have done nothing to continue in the world the tradition of goodness. The palm is his who has been strong both in words and deeds; who has discerned the good, and at the price of his blood has made it triumph. Jesus, from this double point of view, is without parallel. His glory remains entire, and will ever be renewed.

CHAPTER VI.

JOHN THE BAPTIST.

An extraordinary man, whose work, in the absence of documents, remains to us in part enigmatical, appeared about this time, and without question had some relations with Jesus. These rather tended to make the young prophet of Nazareth deviate from his path; but they brought much valuable aid to his religious influence, and at all events furnished his disciples with a very strong authority to recommend their master in the eyes of a certain class of Jews.

About the year 28 of our era (the fifteenth of the reign of Tiberius), there spread through all Palestine the fame of a certain Johanan, or John, a young ascetic full of zeal and passion. John was of the priestly race,[1] born, it would seem, at Juttah, near Hebron, or at Hebron itself.[2] Hebron "the patriarchal city," situated close to the desert of Judæa, and a few hours' journey from the great Arabian desert, was at that time what it is to-day, one of the bulwarks of Semitic life in its austerest form. From his infancy John was a Nazarite, — that is to say, subjected by vow to certain abstinences (Luke i. 15). The desert, by which he was

[1] Luke i. 5; see also a citation from the Ebionite Gospel, preserved by Epiphanius (*Adv. hær.* xxx. 13).

[2] Luke i. 39. It has been suggested, and is not unlikely, that in the "city of Juda" here mentioned we find the town of Juttah (Josh. xv. 55; xxi. 16). Robinson (Biblical Researches, i. 494; ii. 206) found this Juttah, still bearing the same name, two short hours to the south of Hebron.

(so to speak) enveloped, attracted him from the very first (Luke i. 80). Here he led a life like that of a Hindoo Yogi, clad in skins or in cloth of camel's-hair, having for food only locusts and wild honey.[1] A certain number of disciples were grouped around him, sharing his life and brooding upon his severe doctrine. We might imagine ourselves transported to the banks of the Ganges, if special features had not revealed in this recluse the last descendant of the great prophets of Israel.

Since the Jewish nation had begun to reflect with a kind of despair upon its mysterious destiny, the imagination of the people had turned back eagerly to the ancient prophets. Now, of all the personages of the past, whose memory came like the dreams of a troubled night to awaken and agitate the people, the greatest was Elijah. This giant of the Prophets, in his stern solitude of Carmel, sharing the life of wild beasts, dwelling in the hollows of the rocks, whence he issued like a thunderbolt to make and unmake kings, had become, by successive transformations, a sort of superhuman being, sometimes visible, sometimes invisible, and one who had not tasted death. It was generally believed that Elijah would return and restore Israel.[2] The austere life which he had led; the terrible memories he had left behind him, whose impression is still vivid in the East;[3] that sombre portraiture which even in

[1] Matt. iii. 4; Mark i. 6; fragment of the Ebionite Gospel in Epiphanius, *Adv. hær.* xxx. 13.

[2] Mal. iii. 23, 24. Eccles. xlviii. 10. Matt. xvi. 14; xvii. 10–13. Mark vi. 15; viii. 28; ix. 10–13. Luke ix. 8, 19. John i. 21, 25.

[3] The ferocious Abdallah, pasha of St. Jean d'Acre, had nearly died of fright at having seen him in a dream, standing upright upon his mountain. In Christian churches he is seen in pictures surrounded by severed heads; and Moslem believers live in awe of him.

our own days causes trembling and death, — all this mythology, full of vengeance and terrors, powerfully struck the imagination, and stamped as with a birth-mark all the creations of the popular mind. Whoever aspired to any great influence over the people must imitate Elijah; and, as solitary life had been a marked characteristic of that prophet, "the man of God" was depicted in the features of a hermit. All holy personages must have had their days of penance, of solitary life, and of austerity.[1] The desert retreat thus became the condition and the prelude of high destinies.

No doubt this idea of imitation had greatly influenced John's mind (Luke i. 17). The anchorite life, so opposed to the spirit of the ancient Jewish people, having naught to do with vows, such as those of the Nazarites and the Rechabites, was invading Judæa on all sides. The Essenes dwelt near the birthplace of John, on the shores of the Dead Sea.[2] Abstinence from flesh, wine, and sexual indulgence was regarded as the novitiate of the prophets.[3] It was thought that the leaders of a sect should be recluses, having their own rules and institutions, like the founders of religious orders. Teachers of the young were also at times a sort of anchorites, something like the spiritual instructors (*gourous*) of Brahmanism. In fact, was there not in this a remote influence of the silent sages (*munis*) of India? Had not some of those wandering Buddhist monks who overran the world, as the first Franciscans did afterwards, preaching by their show of sanctity, and

[1] Ascension of Isaiah, ii. 9–11.

[2] Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* v. 17; Epiphan. *Adv. hær.* xix. 1, 2; Saulcy, *Voyage autour de la mer Morte*, i. 142 *et seq.*

[3] Daniel i. 12–17; x. 2, 3. Enoch lxxxiii. 2; lxxxv. 3. 4 Esdras ix. 24, 26; xii. 51.

converting people who knew not their language, turned their steps toward Judæa, as they certainly had toward Syria and Babylon?[1] Of this we have no knowledge. Babylon had become for some time a true focus of Buddhism; Boudasp (*Bodhisattva*) was reputed a Chaldæan sage, and the founder of Sabæism. This, as its etymology indicates, was *baptism*,[2] — that is to say, the religion of many baptisms, — the origin of the sect still existing called "Christians of St. John," or Mandæans, whom the Arabs call *el-Mogtasila*, "the Baptists."[3] It is very hard to unravel these vague resemblances. The sects floating between Judaism, Christianity, Baptism, and Sabæism, which we find in the region beyond the Jordan during the first centuries of our era,[4] offer to criticism the most singular problem, in consequence of the confused accounts of them which have come to us. We may believe, at all events, that many of the external practices of John, of the Essenes,[5] and of the Jewish spiritual teachers of this time were derived from influences then recent, coming from the far East. The fundamental practice which gave to the sect of John its character, and has given him his name, has always had

[1] I have developed this hint in the *Hist. génér. des langues Sémitiques*, III. iv. 1; *Journ. Asiat.*, February and March, 1856.

[2] The Aramæan verb *saba*, origin of the name "Sabian," is equivalent to *baptize* (βαπτίζω).

[3] I have discussed this more at length in the *Journal Asiatique*, Nov.–Dec., 1853; Aug.–Sept., 1855. It is to be remarked that the Elkesaïtes, a Sabæan (or Baptist) sect, occupied nearly the same region as the Essenes, — the eastern shore of the Dead Sea, — and were confounded with them. (Epiph. *Adv. hær.* xix. 1, 2, 4; xxx. 16, 17; liii. 1, 2. *Philosophumena*, IX. iii. 15, 16; X. xx. 29.)

[4] See notices by Epiphanius of the Essenes, Hemerobaptists, Nazarenes, Ossæans, Nazaræans, Ebionites, Sampsæans (*Adv. hær.* i. ii.), and by the author of the *Philosophumena* on the Elkesaïtes, ix. x.

[5] Epiphan. *ibid.* xix. xxx. liii.

its centre in lower Chaldæa, and constitutes a religion which has continued there to this day.

This practice was baptism, or total immersion. Ablutions were already familiar to the Jews, as they were to all the religions of the East.[1] The Essenes had given them special extension.[2] Baptism had become an ordinary ceremony at the introduction of proselytes into the bosom of the Jewish religion, — a sort of initiatory rite.[3] But never before the Baptist had there been given to immersion either this form or importance. John had chosen his field of labour in that part of the desert of Judæa which lies near the Dead Sea.[4] At the periods when he administered baptism, he betook himself to the banks of the Jordan (Luke iii. 3), either to Bethany or to Bethabara,[5] on the eastern shore, probably opposite Jericho, or to a place called Ænon ("the Fountains")[6] near Salim, where there was much water.[7] Here con-

[1] Mark vii. 4; Josephus, *Antiq.* XVIII. v. 2; Justin, *Tryph.* 17, 29, 80; Epiphanius, *Adv. hær.* xvii.

[2] Josephus, *Wars*, II. viii. 5, 7, 8, 13.

[3] Mishna, *Pesachim*, viii. 8. Babyl. Talmud, *Jebamoth*, 46 *b*; *Kerithuth*, 9 *a*; *Aboda zara*, 57 *a*. *Masseket Gerim* (ed. Kirchheim, 1851), 38–40.

[4] Matt. iii. 1; Mark i. 4.

[5] John i. 28; iii. 26. All the ancient MSS. have "Bethany;" but as no Bethany is known hereabout, Origen (*in Joann.* vi. 24) proposes "Bethabara," a correction widely accepted. The two names are alike in meaning, seeming to indicate a ferry.

[6] "Ænon" is the Chaldæan plural *ænawan*, "springs."

[7] John iii. 23. The situation is doubtful. The Synoptics uniformly place the scene of John's baptism on the bank of the Jordan (Matt. iii. 6; Mark i. 5; Luke iii. 3); but the circumstance emphasised in the Fourth Gospel, that "there was much water there," is void of sense if we suppose the spot to be close to the river. Taking together verses 22, 23 of John iii., and verses 3, 4 of chap. iv., we are led, besides, to think that Salim was in Judæa. It seems that near the ruin *Ramet-el-Khalil*, near Hebron, there is a locality which meets all these conditions (Sepp, *Jerusalem und das Heilige Land*, Schaffhausen, 1863, i. 520 *et seq.*). Jerome would place

siderable crowds, mainly of the tribe of Judah, thronged about him to be baptized.[1] In a few months he thus became one of the most influential persons in Judæa, and every one must take account of him.

The people considered him a prophet,[2] and many imagined that he was Elijah who was risen from the dead.[3] The belief in such resurrections was widely spread;[4] it was thought that God would raise from their graves certain of the ancient prophets to serve as the leaders of Israel to its final destiny.[5] Others took John for the Messiah himself, although he made no such claim.[6] The priests and scribes, opposed to this revival of prophetism, and always hostile to enthusiasts, despised him. But the popularity of the Baptist awed them, and they dared not speak against him.[7] It was a victory which the feeling of the crowd gained over the priestly aristocracy. When the chief priests were obliged to explain themselves clearly on this point, they were much embarrassed (Matt. xxi. 25, 26).

Baptism, however, was to John nothing more than a sign, designed to make an impression and to prepare men's minds for some great movement. No doubt he was possessed in the highest degree by the messianic hope. "Repent," said he, "for the kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Matt. iii. 2). He announced a "great wrath,"—that is to say, terrible calamities which were

Salim far to the north, near Beth-Shean or Scythopolis; but Robinson (*Bibl. Res.*, iii. 333) could find nothing there to justify this claim.

[1] Mark i. 5; Josephus, *Antiq.* XVIII. v. 2.

[2] Matt. xiv. 5; xxi. 26.

[3] Matt. xi. 14; Mark vi. 15; John i. 21.

[4] Matt. xiv. 2; Luke ix. 8.

[5] See p. 147, note 2.

[6] Luke iii. 15-17; John i. 20.

[7] Matt. xxi. 25, 26; Luke vii. 30.

to come (Matt. iii. 7), and declared that the axe was already "laid at the root of the tree," and that the tree would soon be "cut down and cast into the fire." He described the Messiah with a winnowing-fan in his hand, gathering in the wheat and burning the chaff. Repentance (of which baptism was the type), alms-giving, and moral reformation,[1] were with him the great means of preparation for the coming events. We do not know exactly in what light he looked at these events. What we are sure of is that he preached with much power against the same adversaries whom Jesus attacked later on, — against the rich priests, the Pharisees, the doctors; in one word, against official Judaism; and that, like Jesus, he was specially welcomed by the despised classes.[2] He reduced to nothing the title "son of Abraham," declaring that God could raise up children to Abraham from the stones on the highway (Matt. iii. 9). He does not seem to have possessed, even in germ, the great idea which has made the triumph of Jesus, — the conception of a pure religion; but he powerfully served this idea by substituting a personal rite for those legal ceremonies which required the office of priests, — much as the Flagellants of the Middle Age were precursors of the Reformation, by denying to the official clergy the monopoly of sacraments and of absolution. The general tone of his sermons was severe and stern. The language he used against his adversaries appears to have been most violent:[3] it was harsh and continuous invective. It is probable that he did not remain a complete stranger to politics. Josephus, who was almost in

[1] Luke iii. 11-14; Josephus. *Antiquities*, XVIII. v. 2.
[2] Matt. xxi. 32; Luke iii. 12-14.
[3] Matt. iii. 7; Luke iii. 7.

direct touch with John through his teacher Banou, lets us understand this in cautious words;[1] and the catastrophe which put an end to the Baptist's life seems to imply that it was so. His disciples led a very austere life (Matt. ix. 14), fasted frequently, and affected a sad and anxious demeanour. We see now and then in his teaching a gleam of community in goods, — the tenet that the rich man ought to share his possessions with the poor.[2] The poor man already appears as the one who would be the first to receive benefit from the kingdom of God.

Although John's field of action was Judæa, his fame penetrated quickly to Galilee and reached Jesus, who, by his first discourses, had already gathered round him a little circle of hearers. Exerting scant influence as yet, and wishing doubtless to see a teacher whose instructions had much that was in sympathy with his own ideas, Jesus left Galilee and went with his small group of hearers to visit John.[3] The new-comers were

[1] *Antiquities*, XVIII. v. 2. It is to be noted that when Josephus speaks of the secret and more or less revolutionary doctrines of his countrymen, he hides every hint of messianic beliefs, and, not to offend the Romans, spreads over these doctrines a wash of commonplace, which makes all the heads of Jewish sects seem moral lecturers, or Stoics.

[2] Luke iii. 11 (weak authority).

[3] Matt. iii. 13–17; Mark i. 9–11; Luke iii. 21, 22; John i. 29–34, and iii. 22–24. The Synoptics represent Jesus as having come to John before assuming any public part (comp. Epiphanius, *Adv. hær.* xxx. 13, 14; Justin, *Tryph.* 88). But if it is true, as they say, that John at once recognised and warmly welcomed him, we must suppose that Jesus was already a teacher of some repute. The Fourth Gospel brings him twice to John, — first, when he is still obscure; later, with a company of disciples. Without taking into account the exact journeyings of Jesus, — which cannot be fixed, owing to contradictions in the documents and to the disregard of the evangelists for precision in such things, — or denying that Jesus may have gone to John before he was yet publicly known, we accept the account (John iii. 22–24) that he had already a regular school before sub-

baptized like every one else. John very warmly welcomed this swarm of Galilean disciples, and took it not ill that they kept distinct from his own followers. The teachers were both young; they had many ideas in common; each liked the other, and they vied before the public in acts of mutual regard. At the first glance, such a trait surprises us in John the Baptist, and we are tempted to call it in question. Humility has never been a feature of strong Jewish souls. It might have been expected that a temper so unbending — a sort of Lamennais, always chafed — would be very irritable, and suffer no rivalry or half-way attachment. But this mode of viewing things rests upon a false notion of the person of John. We think of him as an old man: he was, on the contrary, of the same age as Jesus,[1] and very young according to the ideas of the time.[2] In spiritual rank he was the brother, not the father, of Jesus. The two young enthusiasts, full of the same hopes and the same hates, were able to make common cause, and to lean upon each other. Certainly an elder teacher, seeing a man without celebrity approach him with an air of independence, would have resented it: we have scarcely an example of the head of a school receiving with eagerness one who is coming to displace him. But youth is capable of any sacrifice; and it may be readily admitted that John, recognising in Jesus a kindred spirit, received him without misgiving.

mitting to John's baptism. The earlier portion of the Fourth Gospel is made up of separate notes strung together. The strict order of time which they seem to follow comes from the writer's fondness for the appearance of precision. (See above. Introd. p. 61).

[1] We accept here the testimony of Luke (chap. i.), though all the details — in particular those concerning the kinship of John and Jesus — belong to legend.

[2] See John viii. 57.

These kindly relations became afterwards the starting-point of a complete scheme developed by the evangelists, aiming to give John's testimony as the first ground for accepting the divine mission of Jesus. The Baptist had already won such authority, that it was thought impossible to find in the world a better guaranty. But the Baptist was far from having abdicated in favour of Jesus,[1] who, during all the time he passed with him, recognised John as a superior, and but timidly asserted his own peculiar genius.

It would indeed seem that, during some weeks at any rate, notwithstanding his profound originality, Jesus was an imitator of John. The way before him was still obscure. At all times, moreover, he yielded much to opinion, and adopted many things not properly his own, or really essential in his view, simply because they were popular, — provided these additions did not stand in the way of his main purpose, and were always subordinated to it. Baptism had been brought into great favour by John, and Jesus thought himself obliged to follow his example; therefore he baptized, and his disciples also.[2] No doubt they accompanied this ceremony with preaching similar to that of John. The river Jordan was thus covered on both sides with baptizers, whose discourses were more or less successful. The disciple soon equalled the master, and his baptism was much sought. There was some jealousy among the disciples on this point:[3] the followers of John came to him to complain of the increasing success of the young

[1] [As represented in John iii. 28–30.]

[2] John iii. 22–26; iv. 1, 2. The parenthesis of verse 2 seems to be a later comment, or perhaps a scruple of the writer, who corrects himself.

[3] John iii. 26; iv. 1.

Galilean, whose baptism would soon, they feared, supplant his own. But the two masters remained superior to these little jealousies. According to one tradition,[1] it was in the school of John that Jesus gathered the most celebrated group of his disciples. The superiority of John was too indisputable for Jesus, little known as he was, to think of contesting it. He wished to increase under John's shadow, and thought himself obliged, in order to gain the multitude, to employ the outward means which had wrought such astonishing results with John. When he began to preach again after John's arrest, the first words said to have been spoken by him are only the repetition of one of the familiar phrases of the Baptist.[2] Several other expressions of John are found verbally in his discourses.[3] The two schools appear to have lived for a long time with a good mutual understanding,[4] and, after John's death, Jesus, as his trusty friend, was one of the first to be informed of the event.[5]

The prophetic career of John came to a sudden end. Like the old Jewish prophets, he came into the most daring and open opposition to the established authorities.[6] The extreme vivacity of his attacks upon them could not fail to bring him into difficulties. In Judæa, he does not appear to have been disturbed by Pilate; but in Peræa, beyond the Jordan, he invaded the territory of Antipas. This tyrant was uneasy at the political leaven thinly veiled in the preaching of John. The great gatherings of men, drawn about the Baptist by

[1] John i. 35–37; confirmed by Acts i. 21, 22.
[2] Matt. iii. 2; iv. 17.
[3] Matt. iii. 7; xii. 34; xxiii. 33.
[4] Matt. xi. 2–13.
[5] Matt. xiv. 12.
[6] Luke iii. 19.

religious and patriotic enthusiasm, had a suspicious look.[1] Furthermore, a purely personal grievance was added to these motives of state, and rendered the death of the austere censor inevitable.

One of the most strongly marked characters in this tragic family of the Herods was Herodias, a granddaughter of Herod the Great. Violent, ambitious, and passionate, she detested Judaism and despised its laws.[2] She had been married, probably against her will, to her uncle Herod, son of Mariamne,[3] whom Herod the Great had disinherited,[4] and who never held any public position. The inferior rank of her husband, in comparison with the other members of the family, allowed her no peace of mind; she resolved to be sovereign at any cost.[5] Antipas was the instrument she employed. This weak man, desperately enamoured of her, promised to marry her and to repudiate his first wife, the daughter of Hâreth, king of Petra, and emir of the neighbouring tribes of Peræa. The Arabian princess, having obtained a hint of this purpose, resolved to fly. Concealing her design, she pretended that she wished to make a journey to Machærus, in her father's territory, and caused herself to be conducted thither by the officers of Antipas.[6]

Machærus (*Makaur*[7] or *Machero*) was a colossal fortress built by Alexander Jannæus, and rebuilt by Herod,

[1] Josephus, *Antiquities*, XVIII. v. 2. [2] Ibid. v. 4.

[3] In Matt. xiv. 3 and Mark vi. 17 he is called Philip; but this is certainly an error (Josephus, *Antiquities*, XVIII. v. 1, 4). Philip's wife was Salome, daughter of Herodias.

[4] Josephus, *Antiquities*, XVII. iv. 2.

[5] Josephus, *Antiquities*, XVIII. vii. 1, 2; *Wars*, II. ix. 6.

[6] Josephus, *Antiquities*, XVIII. v. 1.

[7] This form occurs in the Jerusalem Talmud (*Schebiit*, ix. 4) and in the Jonathan and Jerusalem Targums (Num. xxii. 35).

in one of the most rugged hollows (*wadis*) to the east of the Dead Sea.[1] It was a wild and savage country, full of extraordinary legends, and was believed to be haunted by demons.[2] The fortress was just on the boundary of the States of Hâreth and Antipas, and at this moment was in the possession of Hâreth. He had been forewarned, and had prepared everything for the flight of his daughter, who was brought back, from tribe to tribe, to Petra.

The almost incestuous union[3] of Antipas and Herodias then took place. The Jewish laws as to marriage were a constant rock of offence between the irreligious family of the Herods and the rigid Jews.[4] The members of this numerous and somewhat isolated dynasty being obliged to intermarry, there resulted frequent violations of the limits prescribed by the Law. John was the echo of the general feeling when he vigorously rebuked Antipas.[5] This was more than enough to decide the latter to give effect to his suspicions. He caused the Baptist to be arrested and confined in the fortress of Machærus, which he had probably seized after the departure of Hâreth's daughter.[6]

More timid than cruel, Antipas did not wish to put John to death. According to certain reports, he feared popular sedition (Matt. xiv. 5). According to another version,[7] he had taken pleasure in listening to his prisoner, and these interviews had thrown him into great

[1] Now Makaur, above the wadi Zerka-Main (Vignes' map of the Dead Sea; Paris, 1865).

[2] Josephus, *Wars*, VII. vi. 1, 2.

[3] Levit. xviii. 16.

[4] Josephus, *Antiquities*, XV. vii. 10.

[5] Matt. xiv. 4; Mark vi. 18; Luke iii. 19.

[6] Josephus, *Antiquities*, XVIII. v. 2.

[7] Mark vi. 20 (reading ἠπόρει for ἐποίει; cf. Luke ix. 7, διηπόρει).

perplexities. What is certain is, that the detention was prolonged, and that John retained even in prison considerable freedom of action.[1] He held intercourse with his disciples, and we find him still in communication with Jesus. His faith in the near coming of the Messiah was only strengthened; he attentively followed the movements outside, and sought to discover in them signs favourable to the accomplishment of the hopes by which he was sustained.

[1] An Oriental prison has no cells: the convict, with feet fettered, is kept in sight in a court or open space, where he talks freely with the passers-by.

CHAPTER VII.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

Until the arrest of John, which we put approximately in the summer of the year 29, Jesus did not quit the neighbourhood of the Dead Sea and the Jordan. A stay in the desert of Judæa was generally looked upon as a preparation for great things, a sort of "retreat" before public acts. Jesus followed the example of those before him, and passed forty days there, fasting strictly, without other companionship than that of wild beasts. The minds of the disciples were much exercised in regard to this sojourn. The desert was, according to popular belief, the abode of demons.[1] There are few regions in the world more desolate, more God-forsaken, more shut off from life, than the rocky slope which forms the western border of the Dead Sea. It was believed that during the time Jesus passed in this frightful country he had gone through terrible trials; that Satan had assailed him with his illusions, or flattered him by seductive promises; and that finally, to reward him for his victory, angels had come and ministered to him.[2]

[1] Tobit viii. 3; Luke xi. 24.

[2] Matt. iv. 1–11; Mark i. 12, 13; Luke iv. 1–13. It is true that the striking likeness of these accounts to the legends of the *Vendidad* (farg. xix.) and the *Lalitaristara* (chaps. xvii. xviii. xxi.) might lead us to regard this stay in the desert as only a myth; but the lean, curt account of Mark, here plainly reflecting the earliest tradition, points to a real fact, which later made the basis of legendary expansion.

It was probably on his return from the desert that Jesus learned the arrest of John the Baptist. He had no further reason now to prolong his stay in a country which was half foreign to him. Perhaps he feared also being involved in the severities inflicted on John, and did not wish to expose himself at a time when, considering the little repute he had, his death could in no way serve the advancement of his ideas. He went back to Galilee,[1] his true home, ripened by a valuable experience, and conscious of his own originality through contact with a great man very different from himself.

On the whole, the influence of John upon Jesus had been of more harm than service to him. It was a check to his development; for everything leads us to believe that when he went toward the Jordan he had ideas superior to those of John, and it was in a mood of concession that he inclined for a moment toward baptism. If the Baptist, from whose authority it would have been difficult to withdraw himself, had remained at liberty, Jesus would not, perhaps, have succeeded in casting off the yoke of rites and externalities. In that case, he would doubtless have remained an unknown Jewish sectary; for the world would not have given up one set of forms to adopt another. It is by the charm of a religion detached from outward forms that Christianity has attracted the higher class of minds. The Baptist once imprisoned, his following was greatly lessened, and Jesus was restored to his own proper career. All that he owed to John was (so to speak) instruction in public address, and skill in winning the popular ear. From that moment, in fact, he preached

[1] Matt. iv. 12; Mark i. 14; Luke iv. 14; John iv. 3.

with much more force, and impressed himself with authority upon the multitude.[1]

It appears also that his stay near John, not so much by the influence of the Baptist as by the natural growth of his own thought, ripened many of his ideas about the "kingdom of heaven." His watchword henceforth is "glad tidings," — the declaration that "the kingdom of God is at hand."[2] He is no longer the delightful moralist merely, aspiring to embody sublime lessons in a few vivid and concise aphorisms; he is a revolutionary of lofty aim, who attempts to renew the world from its very base, and to establish on earth the ideal he has conceived. To "look for the kingdom of God" is the same henceforth as to be a disciple of Jesus.[3] The phrase "kingdom of God" or "kingdom of Heaven," as we have already said,[4] had been long familiar to the Jews. But Jesus gave to it a moral meaning, a social application, which the author of the Book of Daniel himself, in his apocalyptic fervour, had hardly ventured to see dimly in the distance.

In the world as it is, evil has the upper hand. Satan is the "king of this world," and everything obeys him. Kings put the prophets to death. Priests and doctors do not the things which they enjoin on others to do. The righteous are persecuted, and the sole portion of the good is to weep. The "world" is thus the enemy of God and his saints;[5] but God will awake and avenge

[1] Matt. vii. 29; Mark i. 22; Luke iv. 32.

[2] Mark i. 14, 15.

[3] Mark xv. 43.

[4] See *ante*, p. 135.

[5] John i. 10; vii. 7; xiv. 17, 22, 27; xv. 18–20; xvi. 8, 20, 33; xvii. 9, 14, 16, 25. This force of the word "world" is especially marked in the writings of Paul and those ascribed to John.

his saints. The day is at hand; for iniquity is at its height. The reign of goodness is to have its turn.

The advent of this reign of goodness is to be a great and sudden revolution. The world will seem turned upside down; the present state being bad, if we would conceive the future, it is enough to conceive as near as may be the opposite of what now exists. The first shall be last.[1] A new order will rule over mankind. At present the good and the bad are mixed like wheat and tares in a field: the Master lets them grow together; but the hour of abrupt separation is to come.[2] The kingdom of God is to be like the draught of a great net, which gathers both good and bad fish: we put the good into vessels, and cast the bad away.[3] The germ of that great change will be imperceptible at first. It will be like the grain of mustard-seed, the least of all seeds, which being cast into the earth becomes a tree, among whose branches the birds come and lodge;[4] or, again, it will be like the leaven, which, put into dough, leavens the whole lump.[5] A series of parables, often obscure, was designed to express the surprises of that unlooked-for advent, its apparent injustices, its pronounced and inevitable stamp.[6]

Who is to establish this kingdom of God? Let us recall that the first thought of Jesus — a thought so deeply rooted in him that it probably had no source outside, but lay in the very roots of his being — was that he was the son of God, the bosom friend of his Father, the agent of His will. The reply of Jesus to

[1] Matt. xix. 30; xx. 16. Mark x. 31. Luke xiii. 30.
[2] Matt. xiii. 24–30. [3] Ibid. 47–50.
[4] Ibid. 31, 32; Mark iv. 31, 32; Luke xiii. 19.
[5] Matt. xiii. 33; Luke xiii. 21.
[6] Matt. xiii.; xviii. 23–35; xx. 1–18. Luke xiii. 18–30.

such a question could not then be doubtful. The persuasion that he should found the kingdom of God took absolute possession of his mind. He looked upon himself as the universal reformer. Heaven, earth, all Nature, insanity, disease, and death are only his instruments. In the glow of his heroic will, he believes himself all-powerful. If the earth does not lend itself to this complete transformation, it will be broken up, purified by fire and by the breath of God. A new heaven will be created, and the whole earth will be peopled with the angels of God.[1]

A complete revolution,[2] extending to Nature itself,—such was the fundamental idea of Jesus. From this time on, it is certain, he had renounced politics: the fate of Judas the Gaulonite had shown him the uselessness of popular seditions. He never dreamed of revolt against the Romans and the tetrarchs. The wild and anarchical principles of the Gaulonite found no favour with him. His submission to established authority, disdainful in substance, was in form complete. He paid tribute to Cæsar, so as not to give offence. Liberty and right are not of this world; why then trouble himself with vain scruples? Despising the earth, convinced that this world does not merit anxious thought, he sought refuge in his ideal kingdom; he founded that great doctrine of lofty scorn,[3] the true doctrine of the freedom of mind which alone gives peace. But he had not yet said, "My kingdom is not of this world." Much obscurity was mixed with his clearest views.

[1] Matt. xxii. 30. Compare his reported words (Ep. of Barnabas, 6): "Behold, I do the last, even as the first" (*ἰδοὺ ποιῶ τὰ πρῶτα ὡς τὰ ἔσχατα*: ed. Hilgenfeld, p. 18).

[2] "Restitution of all things" (*κατάστασις πάντων*, Acts iii. 21).

[3] Matt. xvii. 24–27; xxii. 16–23.

Sometimes singular temptations crossed his mind. In the desert of Judæa, Satan had offered to him "all the kingdoms of this world." Not knowing the power of the Roman Empire, he might, with the store of enthusiasm there was in Judæa, which led soon after to so terrible a military resistance, — he might, I say, hope to establish a kingdom by the daring and the number of his partisans. Many a time, no doubt, this was the supreme thought with him: "Is the kingdom of God to be realised by force or by gentleness, by revolt or by patience?" One day (we are told) the simple folk of Galilee "would take him by force to make him a king;"[1] but he fled into the mountains, where he remained for a time alone. His lofty nature saved him from the error that would have made him an agitator or a rebel chief, — a Theudas or a Bar-cochab. The revolution which he sought to bring about was ever a moral revolution; but he had not yet gone so far as to trust its fulfilment to angels and the last trump. It was upon men and through men that he wished to act. A visionary, who had no other idea than that the last judgment was close at hand, would not have had this care to benefit the soul, or have taught the noblest moral lesson man has ever received. His thought, no doubt, was still quite vague: it was exalted sentiment rather than a settled plan that urged him on to the sublime work which has been effected by him, though in a manner very different from what he imagined.

It is, in fact, the kingdom of God — I mean, the kingdom of the soul — that he founded; and if from the bosom of his Father he now sees his work bearing fruit through the ages, he may indeed truly say: "This

[1] John vi. 15.

is what I wished." What Jesus has established, what will remain of him forever (allowing for the imperfection that enters into every human achievement), is the doctrine of soul-freedom. Greece already had exalted ideas on the subject.[1] Many Stoics had found means to be free under a tyrant. But, in general, the ancient world had conceived liberty only as belonging to certain political forms: its freemen were known by such names as Harmodius and Aristogeiton, Brutus and Cassius. The true Christian is far more free from every chain: here below he is an exile; what is it to him who is the brief ruler of this earth, which is not his country? Liberty to him is truth.[2] Jesus did not know enough of history to understand how opportune such a doctrine was, at the very moment when republican liberty was expiring, and when the petty municipal institutions of antiquity were dying out in the all-absorbing Roman Empire. But his admirable good sense, and the truly prophetic instinct that he had of his mission, guided him here with marvellous certainty. By these words, "Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things which are God's," he originated something unknown to politics, — a refuge for souls in the midst of an empire of brute force. To be sure, such a doctrine had its dangers. Assume as a principle that to look at a coin is evidence that you recognise a legitimate authority, — proclaim that the perfect man pays tribute disdainfully and without question, — and you annihilate the republic of old, while you strengthen every tyranny. Christianity, in this sense, has contributed much to weaken the sense of duty in the citizen,

[1] See Stobæus, *Florilegium*, chaps. 62, 77, 86 *et seq.*

[2] John viii. 32–36.

and to give the world over to the absolute control of things as they are. But in creating an immense free association, which could for three hundred years hold aloof from politics, Christianity made ample amends for the harm it wrought to civic virtue. Thanks to this, the power of the State was limited to earthly things: the mind was freed; or, at all events, the terrible sceptre of Roman omnipotence was broken forever.

The man who is mainly occupied with the duties of public life does not pardon those who place some other object above his party strifes. He blames those who subordinate political to social questions, and profess a certain indifference to public life. In one sense he is right; for any one course followed to the exclusion of everything else is harmful to the good government of human affairs. But what have parties done to promote the general welfare? If Jesus, instead of founding his heavenly kingdom, had set out for Rome, and had spent himself in conspiring against Tiberius, or in bewailing the loss of Germanicus, what would the world have come to? Neither as a stern republican nor as a zealous patriot would he have stemmed the great public current of his age; while, by declaring the vanity of political aims, he has revealed to the world the truth that country is not everything, and that the man is before and above the citizen.

Our maxims of positive science are offended by the importance given to dreams in the scheme of Jesus. We know the history of the world. A revolution like that he looked for is brought about only by geological or astronomical causes; and no one has ever shown their connection with things moral. But to be just to great originators, we must not stop with the prejudices

they may have shared. Columbus discovered America, though he started with notions completely false; Newton believed his wild exposition of the Apocalypse to be as well-founded as his theory of gravitation. Shall we place an average man of our times above a Francis of Assisi, a Saint Bernard, a Joan of Arc, or a Luther, because he is without the errors that these persons have taught? Ought we to measure men by the correctness of their ideas of physics, or by their more or less exact knowledge of the true world-system? Let us understand better the position of Jesus and what made his strength. The Deism of the eighteenth century and a certain Protestant temper have accustomed us to regard the founder of the Christian faith merely as a great moralist, a benefactor of mankind. We see nothing more in his gospel than good maxims; we throw a convenient veil over the strange intellectual state which he was born to. There are some, too, who regret that the French Revolution started out from first principles, and that it was not conducted by wise and moderate men. Let us not — thrifty citizens that we are — impose our petty schemes on those extraordinary movements which are so far above our grasp! Let us continue to admire the gospel "morality;" let us suppress in our religious teachings the chimera which was the soul of it, — but let us not imagine that the world is moved by mere ideas of happiness or of personal morality. The idea of Jesus was much more profound: it was the most revolutionary idea that human brain ever brooded over. The historian must take it as a whole, not with those timid suppressions which prune it of the very thing which has rendered it efficacious for the regeneration of mankind.

At bottom, the ideal is always a Utopia. When we wish at this day to represent the Christ of the modern conscience, the Comforter, the Judge of our new time, what do we do? What Jesus himself did over eighteen hundred years ago. We suppose the conditions of the real world quite other than they are: we paint a moral liberator breaking without weapons the fetters of the negro slave, bettering the condition of the common people, delivering oppressed nations. We forget that this implies the overturning of the world, an altered climate in Virginia and on the Congo, a change of blood and race in millions of men, our complex social condition reduced to a chimerical simplicity, and the political stratifications of Europe displaced from their natural order. The "restitution of all things" [1] desired by Jesus was not more difficult. That new earth, that new heaven, that new Jerusalem coming down from heaven, the cry, "Behold, I make all things new," [2] are the ordinary marks of the reformer. The contrast of the ideal with the sad reality will ever produce in mankind those revolts against cold reason which common minds call folly until the day of their triumph comes, when those who have resisted them are the first to acknowledge their lofty wisdom.

That there was a contradiction between the dogma of an immediate end of the world and the general moral teaching of Jesus, looked at in view of a permanent state of humanity much like that which now exists, no one will attempt to deny.[3] It was exactly this inconsistency

[1] Acts iii. 21. [2] Revel. xxi. 1, 2, 5.

[3] The English [and American] Adventists show the same inconsistency, — a belief in the near end of the world, along with much good sense in common life, and wonderful shrewdness in manufactures and trade.

which insured the success of his work. The Adventist alone would have done nothing to last; the moralist alone would have done nothing mighty: the one gave the impelling force, the other insured the future. Thus Christianity united the two conditions of great success in this world, — a revolutionary starting-point, and the capacity to live. Everything made to succeed must satisfy these two wants; for the world needs both to change and to endure. Jesus, at the same time that he announced an unparalleled overthrow in human affairs, proclaimed the principles upon which society has reposed these eighteen hundred years.

That which, in fact, distinguishes Jesus from the agitators of his time, and from those of all times, is his perfect idealism. In one view Jesus was an anarchist, for he had no notion of civil government, which seemed to him an abuse, pure and simple. He speaks of it in vague terms, like an ordinary person who knows nothing of politics. Every magistrate seems to him a natural enemy of the people of God; he forewarns his disciples of conflicts with the civil powers, without dreaming for a moment that there is anything in this to be ashamed of.[1] But the desire to supplant the rich and powerful never appears in him. His aim is to annihilate wealth and power, not to grasp them. He foretells to his disciples[2] persecutions and torture, but in no single case is there a hint of armed resistance. The idea that one is all-powerful through suffering and resignation, that one triumphs over force through purity of heart, is an idea that belongs to Jesus alone. He

[1] Matt. x. 17, 18; Luke xii. 11.

[2] Matt. v. 10–12; x. throughout. Luke vi. 22, 23. John xv. 18–20; vi. 2–4, 20, 33; xvii. 14.

is not a spiritualist; for to him everything looks to a practical end. But he is a thoroughgoing idealist: matter is to him but the sign of the idea, and the actual is but a vivid type of the invisible.

To whom shall we appeal, upon whom shall we rely, to found the kingdom of God? Jesus never wavered upon this point. "That which is highly esteemed among men is an abomination in the sight of God" (Luke xvi. 15). The founders of the kingdom of God will be the simple, — not the rich, the doctors, or the priests; but women, common people, the humble, little children.[1] The one chief sign of the Messiah is, "The poor have the gospel preached to them" (Matt. xi. 5). The idyllic and gentle nature of Jesus is here uppermost. A vast social revolution, in which rank should be levelled and all authority brought low, was his dream. The world will not believe him, the world will kill him; but his followers will not be of the world:[2] they will be a small band of the lowly and humble, who will conquer by their very humility. The sentiment which made "worldly" the antithesis of "Christian" is completely justified by the thought of the Master himself.[3]

[1] Matt. v. 3, 10; xviii. 3; xix. 14, 23, 24; xx. 16; xxi. 31; xxii. 2–14. Mark x. 14, 15, 23–25. Luke i. 51–53; iv. 18, 19; vi. 20; xiii. 30; xiv. 11; xviii. 14, 16, 17, 24, 25.

[2] John xv. 19; xvii. 14, 16.

[3] See, above all, John xvii., which contains, not a real discourse spoken by Jesus, but a sentiment profoundly felt by his disciples, which flowed legitimately from his teaching.

CHAPTER VIII.

AT CAPERNAUM.

HAUNTED by an idea more and more imperious, Jesus henceforth follows calmly, as if under a certain doom, the path marked out for him by his astonishing genius and the extraordinary circumstances in which he lived. Till now, he has only imparted his thoughts to a few persons secretly drawn toward him; henceforward his teaching becomes public, and follows a fixed plan. He was now about thirty years of age.[1] The small group of hearers who went with him to John was undoubtedly increased, and perhaps he had been joined by some of John's disciples.[2] With this first nucleus of a church, on his return into Galilee he boldly proclaimed the "glad tidings of the kingdom of God." This kingdom was at hand; and he, Jesus, was that "Son of Man" whom Daniel in his vision had beheld as the divine herald of the final and supreme revelation.

We must remember that to the Jewish mind, averse as it was to art and mythology, the simple human form was nobler than that of Cherubim, or those creatures of fancy which the imagination of the people,

[1] Luke iii. 23; Ebionite Gospel (Epiph. *Adv. hær.* xxx. 13); Valentinus (Iren. *Adv. hær.* I. i. 3; II. xxii. 1, 2. Epiph. ibid. li. 28, 29). John viii. 57 has no bearing here, "fifty years" being a general expression of age. Irenæus (ibid. xxii. 5, 6) does little more than echo John, though claiming to rest on the tradition of the "elders" of Asia.

[2] John i. 37–43.

since it had been under the influence of Assyria, conceived as grouped about the Divine Majesty. Already in Ezekiel,[1] the Being seated on the supreme throne, far above the monsters of the mysterious chariot, the great revealer of prophetic visions, has the countenance of a man. In the Book of Daniel, amidst the vision of empires represented by the apocalyptic "beasts," at the moment when the great assize begins, and when the books are opened, a Being "like a Son of Man" comes before the Ancient of Days, who bestows on him the power to judge the world and to govern it forever. "Son of Man," in the Semitic languages, especially in the Aramæan dialects, is a mere synonym of "man." But this chief passage of Daniel struck the mind: the phrase "Son of Man" became, at least in certain schools,[2] one of the titles of the Messiah, regarded as judge of the world and as king of the new era about to open.[3] The application made of it by Jesus to himself, accordingly, proclaims his messiahship, and affirms the coming catastrophe in which he was

[1] Chap. i. 5, 26-28.

[2] In John xii. 34 the Jews appear unfamiliar with this meaning of the phrase.

[3] Matt. x. 23; xiii. 41; xvi. 27, 28; xix. 28; xxiv. 27, 30, 37, 39, 44, xxv. 31; xxvi. 64. Mark xiii. 26; xiv. 62. Luke xii. 40; xvii. 24, 26, 30; xxi. 27, 36; xxii. 69. Acts vii. 55. But the most decisive passage is John v. 27 ["He hath given him authority to exercise judgment also, *because he is the Son of Man*"], when put beside Rev. i. 13 and xiv. 14. Compare Book of Enoch xlvi. 1–4; xlviii. 2, 3; lxii. 5, 7, 9, 14; lxix. 26, 27, 29; lxx. 1 (Dillmann's arrangement): also 4 Esdras xiii. 2 *et seq.*, 12, 13, 25, 32 (Ethiopic, Arabic, and Syriac versions, eds. of Ewald, Volkmar, and Ceriani), Ascension of Isaiah (Venetian Latin text of 1522, col. 702, Migne's ed.), and Justin, *Tryph.*, 49, 76. The expression "Son of woman,' denoting the Messiah, is found once in Enoch lxii. 5. It is to be remarked that the entire passage of Enoch, chapters xxxii. to lxxi., is suspected to be interpolated. The Fourth Book of Esdras was written in the reign of Nerva [A. D. 68], by a Jew under the influence of Christian ideas.

to appear as Judge, invested with the full powers delegated to him by the Ancient of Days.

The teaching of the new prophet had this time a marked success. A group of men and women, all filled with the same spirit of youthful candour and simple innocence, thronged to him and said, "Thou art the Messiah!" As the Messiah was to be the Son of David, this appellation, synonymous with the other, was naturally conferred upon him; and he accepted it with pleasure, though it caused him some embarrassment, since his origin was well known. For himself, he preferred the title "Son of Man," one apparently humble, but connected directly with the messianic hopes. This was the name by which he designated himself;[1] so that in his mouth "Son of Man" was a synonym of the pronoun "I," which he avoided using. But no one ever addressed him thus, doubtless because the title did not quite apply to him until the day of his second coming.

The centre of Jesus' action, at this period of his life, was the little town Capernaum, situated on the shore of the lake of Gennesareth. The name "Capernaum" — into which enters the word *caphar*, "village" — seems to denote a small town of the old style, in contrast to the great cities built in the Roman fashion, such as Tiberias.[2] The name was so little known that Josephus, in one passage of his writings,[3] takes it for the name of a fountain, the fountain having more celebrity than the village close to it. Like Nazareth, Capernaum

[1] It occurs 83 times in the Gospels, always in his own discourses.

[2] It is true that Tell-Hum, commonly identified with Capernaum, shows some ruins of quite handsome monuments; but the identification is doubtful, and these may belong to the second or third century after Christ.

[3] Josephus, *Wars*, III. x. 8.

had no history, and had not shared in the profane movement favoured by the Herods. Jesus was much attached to this town, and made it a second home.[1]

Shortly after his return, Jesus made an experiment of little success at Nazareth:[2] as one of his biographers naïvely remarks, he could do "no mighty work" there.[3] His family were of small account, and the knowledge that was had of them was hurtful to his authority. People could not regard as the son of David one whose brother, sister, and brother-in-law they were meeting every day. Besides, it is to be noted that his family strongly opposed him, refusing outright to believe in his divine mission.[4] At one time his mother and brothers maintained that he had lost his senses, and treated him as an excited dreamer, attempting to restrain him by force.[5] The Nazarenes, still more violent, desired (it is said) to kill him by throwing him down from a steep rock.[6] Jesus pointedly retorted that this risk was common to him with all great men, and applied to himself the proverb, "A prophet hath no honour in his own country."

This check was far from discouraging him. He returned to Capernaum,[7] where he found the people

[1] Matt. ix. 1; Mark ii. 1. Capernaum appears in the Talmud as the town of heretics (*minim*), who are here evidently Christians. Midrash, *Koheleth* (Eccl.), vii. 26.

[2] Matt. xiii. 54–58; Mark vi. 1–6; Luke iv. 16–30; John iv. 44.

[3] Mark vi. 5; comp. Matt. xiii. 58; Luke iv. 23.

[4] Matt. xiii. 57; Mark vi. 4; John vii. 3–5.

[5] Mark iii. 21, 31–35, noting the connection of the verses 20, 21, 31, even if we read in 31 καὶ ἔρχονται instead of ἔρχονται οὖν.

[6] This is probably the sharp cliff near Nazareth, above the present Maronite church; not the so-called "mount of precipitation," at an hour's distance from Nazareth (see Robinson, ii. 335 *et seq.*).

[7] Matt. iv. 13; Luke iv. 31; John ii. 12.

much more favourably disposed to him; and from this point he organised a series of missions among the small surrounding towns. The villagers of this beautiful and fertile country rarely came together except on the Sabbath. This was the day he chose for his teaching. Each town had then its synagogue, or place of meeting. It was a square room, quite small, with a porch decorated in the Greek style. The Jews, not having any architecture of their own, never attempted to give to these edifices an original design. The remains of many ancient synagogues are still to be seen in Galilee.[1] They are all constructed of large and good materials; but their style is rather paltry, owing to the profusion of floral ornaments, foliage, and scroll-work which characterise Jewish monuments.[2] In the interior there were benches, a desk for public reading, and a closet for holding the sacred rolls.[3] These edifices, which had nothing of the Temple about them, were the centre of all Jewish life. Here the people gathered on the Sabbath for prayer, and for the reading of the Law and the Prophets. As Judaism, outside of Jerusalem, had (properly speaking) no clergy, the first to arrive

[1] At Tell Hum, Irbid (Arbela), Meiron (Mero), Jisch (Gischala), Kasyoun, Nabartein; two at Kefr-Bereim.

[2] I do not as yet venture to pronounce on the age of these monuments, or, consequently, to assert that Jesus taught in any of them. On such a supposition, what interest there would be in the synagogue of Tell Hum! The great synagogue of Kefr-Bereim seems to me the oldest of all; it is in quite a pure style. That of Kasyoun has a Greek inscription of the time of Septimius Severus. The great importance of Judaism in upper Galilee after the war of Hadrian leads us to think that many of these edifices are not of earlier date than the third century, when Tiberias became a sort of Jewish capital. (See *Journ. Asiat.* December, 1864, p. 531 *et seq.*)

[3] 2 Esdras viii. 4; Matt. xxiii. 6; James iii. 2; Mishna, *Magilla*, iii. 1; *Rosch hasschana*, iv. 7 etc. See, especially, the curious description of the synagogue at Alexandria in the Babylonian Talmud, *Sukka*, 51 *b*.

stood up and read the lessons (*parascha* and *haphtara*) of the day, adding comments of his own (*midrasch*), in which he set forth his views.[1] This was the origin of the "homily," whose finished model we find in the smaller treatises of Philo. The hearers had a right to interrupt and to question the reader: thus the assembly degenerated quickly into a meeting for free discussion.[2] It had a president (ἀρχισυνάγωγος), "elders" (πρεσβύτεροι), a recognised reader or apparitor (ὑπηρέτης, *hazzan*), deputies (ἄγγελοι or ἀπόστολοι), a sort of secretaries or messengers, who conducted the correspondence between the different synagogues, and a sacristan (διάκονος, *schammasch*).[3] The synagogues were thus really small independent republics; they had a wide jurisdiction, endorsed acts of emancipation, and exercised a protectorate over the freedmen.[4] Like all municipal corporations up to an advanced period of the Roman Empire, they issued honorary decrees,[5] voted resolutions which had the force of law in the community, and pronounced sentences of corporal punishment, which were regularly executed by the *hazzan*.[6]

With the eager activity of mind that has always

[1] Philo in Euseb., *Præp. evang.* viii. 7; *quod omnis probus liber*, 12. Luke iv. 16. Acts xiii. 15; xv. 21. Mishna, *Magilla*, iii. 4.

[2] See Garucci, *Dissert. archeol.* ii. 161 *et seq.*

[3] Mark v. 22, 35. Luke iv. 20; vii. 3; viii. 41, 49; xxiii. 14. Acts xiii. 15; xviii. 8, 17. Rev. ii. 4. Mishna, *Joma*, vii. 1; *Rosch hasschana*, iv. 9; Jerusalem Talmud, *Sanhedrin*, i. 7; Epiphan. *Adv. hær.* xxx. 4, 11.

[4] *Antiq. du Bosph. Cimm.* inscr. 22, 23; *Mélanges gréco-lat.* of the St. Petersburg Academ, ii. 200; Lévy, *Epigraphische Beiträge zur Geschichte der Juden*, 273, 298.

[5] Inscr. of Berenice, in the *Corpus inscr. Græc.* No. 5361; inscr. of Kasyoun, in *Journal Asiatique*, l. c.

[6] Matt. v. 25; x. 17; xxiii. 34. Mark xiii. 9. Luke xii. 11; xxi. 12. Acts xxii. 19; xxvi. 11. 2 Cor. xi. 24. Mishna, *Maccoth*, iii 12; Babylonian Talmud, *Magilla*, 7 *b*; Epiph. *Adv. hær.* xxx. 11.

characterised the Jews, such an institution, despite the arbitrary restraints it incurred, could not fail to give rise to very animated discussions. Thanks to the synagogues, Judaism has been able to pass unscathed through eighteen centuries of persecution. These were so many little separate worlds, which at once conserved the national spirit and offered a ready field for intestine struggles. Here was vented an enormous amount of passion. Disputes for precedence were keen. To have a seat of honour in the first row was the prize of lofty piety, or the most envied privilege of wealth.[1] On the other hand, the liberty that allowed any who would to appoint himself reader and expounder of the sacred text, offered wonderful facilities for the propagation of new ideas. This was one of the great opportunities of Jesus, and the means he most often used in establishing his doctrine.[2] He entered the synagogue and stood up to read; the *hazzan* gave him the scroll, which he unrolled; then, reading from it the lesson of the day (*parasha*, or *haphtara*), he drew from this reading some inference confirming his own view.[3] As there were few Pharisees in Galilee, the discussion did not take that heated and acrimonious tone of opposition which in Jerusalem would have stopped him short at the very first step. These kind-hearted Galileans had never heard a discourse so well adapted to their cheerful fancy.[4] They admired and made much of him; they found that he spoke well, and that his argument was convincing. He confidently solved the hardest ques-

[1] Matt. xxiii. 6; James ii. 3; Babylonian Talmud, *Sukka*, 51 *b*.

[2] Matt. iv. 33; ix. 35. Mark i. 21, 39; vi. 2. Luke iv. 15, 16, 31, 44; xiii. 10. John xviii. 20.

[3] Luke iv. 16–20; cf. Mishna, *Joma*, vii. 1.

[4] Matt. vii. 28; xiii. 54. Mark i. 22; vi. 1. Luke iv. 22, 32.

tions; the almost poetic rhythm of his discourse captivated these people, still young at heart, — not yet dried up by the pedantry of the doctors.

Thus the authority of the young Master continued to increase daily; and, naturally, the more others believed in him, the more he believed in himself. His field of action was very narrow. It was wholly confined to the basin of the Lake of Tiberias, and even here there was one locality which he preferred. The lake is five or six leagues long, and three or four broad; though in appearance a quite regular oval, it forms, from Tiberias to the inflow of the Jordan, a sort of bay, whose curve measures about ten miles. This was the field in which the seed sown by Jesus found at length a congenial soil. Let us run over it step by step, and try to lift off the mantle of aridity and desolation which the demon of Islam has thrown about it.

Starting from Tiberias, we come to steep rocks, and a mountain which seems crumbling into the water. The mountains then recede, and a plain (*El Ghoueir*) opens out almost level with the lake. It is a charming grove of bright green, furrowed by abundant streams, which issue partly from a great round reservoir of ancient construction (*Ain Medawara*). On the verge of this plain, which is the land of Gennesareth proper, we find the miserable village of Medjdel. At the farther side of the plain (still following the lake) we come upon the site of a town (*Khan Minyeh*), with charming streams (*Ain-et-Tin*), a pretty road, narrow and deep, cut in the rocks, no doubt often travelled by Jesus, which serves as a highway between the plain of Gennesareth and the steep northern shore of the lake. A mile from this place the traveller crosses a narrow stream of salt water (*Ain*

Tabiga) issuing from several large springs a few yards from the lake, and entering it in the midst of a dense mass of verdure. After a farther journey of forty minutes over the arid slope which stretches from Ain Tabiga to the inflow of the Jordan, we at last find some huts and a collection of monumental ruins, called *Tell-Hum*.

Five small towns, whose names will be forever as familiar in the speech of men as those of Rome or Athens, were in the time of Jesus scattered along the space which stretches from the village of Medjdel to Tell-Hum. Of these five towns — Magdala, Dalmanutha, Capernaum, Bethsaida, and Chorazin — the first alone can to-day be identified with any certainty.[1] The horrid little village of Medjdel [Magdala] has doubtless retained the name and locality of the hamlet that gave to Jesus his tenderest friend;[2] Dalmanutha is wholly unknown.[3] Possibly Chorazin was a little inland, on the north side.[4] As for Bethsaida and Capernaum, they have been identified almost at random with Tell-Hum, Ain-et-Tin, Khan Minyeh, and Ain Meda-

[1] The ancient Kinnereth [Gennesareth] has disappeared or changed its name.

[2] Magdala is known to have been close to Tiberias: Jerusalem Talmud, *Maasaroth*, iii. 1; *Schebiit*, ix. 1; *Erubin*, v. 7.

[3] Mark viii. 10. In the parallel passage (Matt. xv. 39) the common reading is Μαγδαλά; but this is a late alteration from the true reading Μαγαδάν (p. 151, *note*, below). ΜΑΓΑΔΑΝ seems to be an alteration for ΔΑΛΜΑΝουθα (see *Comptes rendus de l'Acad. des inscr. et belles lettres*, Aug. 17, 1866). Right upon the Jordan, about five miles below its outflow from the lake, there is an ancient locality called *Dalhamia* or *Dalmamia* (see Thomson, "The Land and the Book," ii. 60, 61, and Van de Velde's map). But Mark viii. 10 assumes Dalmanutha to be on the lake shore.

[4] At the place called *Khorazi* or *Bir-Kerazeh*, above Tell-Hum (Van de Velde's map, and Thomson, ii. 13).

wara.[1] In topography, as in history, it might indeed be said that a profound design has sought to conceal the traces of the great Founder. It is doubtful whether, upon that wofully devastated soil, we shall ever succeed in fixing the spots whither mankind would gladly come to kiss his footprints.

The lake, the horizon, the shrubs, the flowers, are all that remain of the little canton, three or four leagues in extent, where Jesus planted his divine work. The trees have totally disappeared. In this country, where the vegetation was once so rich that Josephus saw in it a kind of miracle, — Nature, he says, being pleased to bring forth side by side the herbage of colder countries, the products of tropic regions, and the trees of temperate climes, laden all the year round with flowers and fruits,[2] — in this country you must now calculate a day beforehand the place where you may find a bit of shade for the morrow's noonday halt. The lake is deserted. A single battered boat now furrows the waves once so filled with life and joy. But the waters are still smooth and clear.[3] The beach, formed of rocks and pebbles,

[1] The old theory identifying Tell-Hum with Capernaum, though of late strongly opposed, still has many defenders. The best argument in its favour is the name itself; since *Tell* is found in the name of many villages, or may have taken the place of *Caphar* (see an instance in the *Archives des missions scientifiques*, 2d ser. iii. 369). On the other hand, near Tell-Hum no spring can be found answering to the account of Josephus (*Wars*, III. x. 8). This spring at Capernaum might seem to be *Ain-Medawara;* but this is half a league from the lake, while Capernaum is a fishing-village on the water front (Matt. iv. 13; John vi. 17). The case of Bethsaida is still more perplexing; for the generally admitted theory of two Bethsaidas on opposite sides of the lake, eight or nine miles apart, is rather forced.

[2] Josephus, *Wars*, III. x. 8; Babylonian Talmud, *Pesachim*, 8 *b;* Siphré, *Vezoth habberaka*.

[3] Josephus, *Wars*, III. x. 7; Jacob of Vitry [a French ecclesiastic, as-

is indeed that of a small sea, not that of a pond or mere, like the banks of Lake Huleh (Merom). It is clean, neat, without sediment, always beaten on the same spot by the gentle motion of the waves. Little promontories, covered with rose-laurels, tamarisks, and prickly caper-bushes, stand out in relief; at two places especially — at the outflow of the Jordan near Tarichæa, and at the edge of the plain of Gennesareth — there are lovely meadows, where the waves lose themselves in masses of turf and flowers. The brook Ain-Tabiga forms a little bay, full of pretty shells. Flocks of water-fowl cover the lake. The horizon is of a dazzling brightness. The sky-blue water, deeply shut in by scorching rocks, appears, when viewed from the summit of the mountains of Safed, to lie in the hollow of a cup of gold. To the north, the snowy ravines of Hermon are traced in white lines upon the sky; to the west, the high, undulating table-land of Gaulonitis and Peræa, absolutely barren and clothed by the sun with an atmosphere soft as velvet, form one compact mountain, or rather a long high terrace, which runs from Cæsarea-Philippi to the south as far as the eye can reach.

The heat upon the shore is at this day very oppressive. The lake lies in a depression more than six hundred feet below the Mediterranean level,[1] and thus shares the torrid conditions of the Dead Sea. A luxurious vegetation formerly tempered these excessive

sailant of the Albigenses, and agent of a charitable mission in Palestine about 1200], *Gesta Dei per Francos*, i. 1075.

[1] This is the reckoning of M. Voguës (*Connaissance des temps* for 1866), closely agreeing with that of Captain Lynch (in Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xv. pt. 1, p. xx.) and that of Bertou (*Bulletin de la Soc. de géogr.* ser. 2, xii. 146). The depression of the Dead Sea is more than twice as much.

heats. One can hardly understand that a furnace such as the entire basin now is, in and after the month of May, was ever the scene of so vast activity. Besides, Josephus found the climate very temperate.[1] Undoubtedly there has been here, as in the Roman Campagna, some change of climate brought about by historical causes. It is Islamism, and, above all, the Mussulman reaction against the Crusades, that has withered, as with a blast of death, the region beloved by Jesus. The beautiful land of Gennesareth did not suspect that beneath the calm brow of this peaceful wayfarer its destinies were at stake. This dangerous compatriot has been the ruin of the country which had the perilous honour of giving him birth. Loved or else hated by all the world, grasped at by two rival fanaticisms, Galilee as the price of its glory must be changed into a desert. But who will say that Jesus would have been happier if he had lived to the full age of man obscure in his own village? As for those ungrateful Nazarenes, who would ever think of them, if one of their number had not, at the risk of compromising the future of their town, recognised his true Father, and proclaimed himself the Son of God?

At the time of which we speak, four or five large villages, situated about half an hour's walk apart, form the little world of Jesus. He seems never to have visited Tiberias, a heathen city, peopled in great part by Gentiles, and the ordinary residence of Antipas.[2] Sometimes, however, he wandered away from his favourite region. For instance, he went by boat along

[1] Josephus, *Wars*, III. x. 7, 8.

[2] Josephus, *Antiq.* XVIII. iii. 2; *Life*, 12, 13, 64.

the eastern shore to Gergesa.[1] In the north, we find him at Paneas, or Cæsarea-Philippi, at the foot of Mount Hermon.[2] Once he went as far as the coasts of Tyre and Sidon,[3] a country which at that time was very flourishing. In all these countries he was surrounded with paganism.[4] At Cæsarea he saw the celebrated grotto of Panium, considered as the source of the Jordan, which popular belief had wreathed about with many a strange legend;[5] he could admire the marble temple that Herod had erected near there in honour of Augustus;[6] he stopped probably before the numerous votive statues erected to Pan, to the Nymphs, to the Echo of the grot, which piety was perhaps already grouping in this beautiful spot.[7] A rationalising Jew, accustomed to look on strange gods as deified men or demons, would consider all these symbolic figures as

[1] I follow Thomson (*The Land and the Book*, ii. 34) in assuming Gergasa (Matt. viii. 28) to be the same with the Canaanite town Girgash (Gen. x. 16 and xv. 21; Deut. vii. 1; Josh. xxiv. 11), and the spot now called *Kersa* or *Gersa*, on the eastern shore, nearly opposite Magdala. Mark v. 1 and Luke viii. 26 give the name "Gadara" or "Gerasa" instead of "Gergesa." Gerasa is out of the question, since the Gospels show that the town was near the lake and opposite Galilee. As to Gadara (now *Om-Keis*), an hour and a half from the lake and the Jordan, the local circumstances given by Mark and Luke do not admit it. We understand, too, how "Gergasa" may have become "Gerasa," a name better known; and how the topographical difficulties thus raised suggested Gadara. (Cf. Origen *Comm. in Joann.* vi. 24; x. 10. Eusebius and Jerome, *De situ et nominibus locorum hebræorum* Γεργέσα, Γεργασεί.)

[2] Matt. xvi. 13; Mark viii. 27.

[3] Matt. xv. 21; Mark vii. 24, 31.

[4] Josephus, *Life*, 13.

[5] Josephus, *Antiq.* XV. x. 3: *Wars*, I. xxi. 3; III. x. 7. Benjamin of Tudela, p. 46 (ed. Asher).

[6] Josephus, *Antiq.* XV. x. 3; *Wars*, I. xxi. 3. Comp. the coins of Philip (Madden, *Hist. of Jewish Coinage*, p. 101 *et seq*).

[7] *Corp. inscr. græc.*, 4537, 4538, 4538 *b*, 4539. These inscriptions, it is true, are mostly of quite modern date.

idols. The fascinations of Nature-worship, which intoxicated more emotional races, left him cold. Doubtless Jesus had no knowledge of what the ancient sanctuary of Melkarth at Tyre might still contain of a primitive worship more or less akin to the Jewish.[1] Paganism, which in Phœnicia had planted on every hill a temple and a sacred grove, with all that show of vast industry and ungodly wealth could have small charm for him.[2] Monotheism takes away all capacity to understand pagan religions. A Mussulman, suddenly introduced into polytheistic countries, seems to have no eyes. Certainly, Jesus learned nothing in these journeys. He always came back to his much loved shore of Gennesareth. His thoughts were centred here, and here he found faith and love.

[1] Lucian, *De dea Syria*, 3.

[2] Traces of the rich pagan civilisation of this period abound throughout the *Beled-Besharrah*, especially on the heights which form the promontories Blanco and Nakura.

CHAPTER IX.

THE DISCIPLES.

In this earthly paradise, little touched as yet by great historic changes, lived a people in perfect harmony with the country itself, — active, honest, with a feeling of life at once gay and tender. The Lake of Tiberias is one of the best fishing-grounds in the world.[1] Very productive fisheries had been established, particularly at Bethsaida and Capernaum, and had created a certain opulence. These fishermen's families formed a gentle and peaceable society, extending, by means of numerous ties of relationship, throughout the lake region we have described. Their leisurely way of life left their imagination quite free. The ideas concerning the kingdom of God found in these little groups of kindly people more credence than anywhere else. Nothing that we call civilisation, in the Greek or worldly sense, had yet found its way among them. They had not our German or Celtic severity of temper; their kind-heartedness may have been on the surface, without depth, — but in character they were gentle, in mind quick-witted and intelligent. We can imagine them as being somewhat like the better populations of the Lebanon, but with the capacity which these have not, of producing great men.

[1] Matt. iv. 18; Luke v. 4–9; John i. 44, and xxi. 1–8. Josephus, *Wars*, III. x. 70; Jerusalem Talmud, *Pesachim*, iv. 2; Babylonian Talmud, *Baba kama*, 80 *b*; Jacobus de Vitry, *Gesta*, etc. i. 1075.

Jesus met there his true kindred. He lived among them as one of them. Capernaum became "his own city;"[1] and, amid the little circle that adored him, he forgot his sceptic brothers, ungrateful Nazareth, and its mocking incredulity.

One house especially, at Capernaum, offered him an agreeable asylum and devoted disciples. It was the home of two brothers, — sons of one Jonas, who was probably dead at the time when Jesus came to fix his abode upon the border of the lake. These two brothers were Simon — surnamed *Kephas* ("a stone") in Syro-Chaldaic; in Greek, *Petros*[2] — and Andrew. They were born at Bethsaida,[3] and were already settled in Capernaum when Jesus began his public life. Peter was married and had children, his mother-in-law living with him.[4] Jesus loved that house, and customarily abode there.[5] Andrew appears to have been a disciple of John the Baptist, and Jesus had probably known him on the banks of the Jordan.[6] The two brothers, even when they might seem most occupied with their Master, still continued to follow the calling of fishermen.[7] Jesus, who was fond of playing upon words, used to say that

[1] Matt. ix. 1; Mark ii. 1, 2.

[2] The surname Κηφᾶς is apparently the same with Καϊάφας, that of the high-priest, Joseph Caiaphas. The name Πέτρος is found in Josephus (*Antiq.* XVIII. vi. 3) as the proper name of a contemporary. We are thus led to think that Jesus did not bestow upon him this epithet, but rather gave emphasis to the name which his disciple already had.

[3] John i. 44.

[4] Matt. viii. 14; Mark i. 30; Luke iv. 38; 1 Cor. ix. 5; 1 Pet. v. 13. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iii. 6 and vii. 11; Pseudo-Clem. *Recogn.* vii. 25; Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* iii. 30.

[5] Matt. viii. 14 and xvii. 24; Mark i. 29–31; Luke iv. 38.

[6] John i. 40, 41.

[7] Matt. iv. 18; Mark i. 16; Luke v. 3; John xxi. 3.

he would make them fishers of men.[1] In fact, among all his disciples none were more firmly attached to him.

Another family, that of Zabdiah or Zebedee, a well-to-do fisherman and the owner of several boats,[2] gave Jesus a hearty welcome. Zebedee had two sons, — James, who was the elder, and a younger son, John, who later on was called to play so important a part in the history of infant Christianity. Both were zealous disciples. It would seem from certain hints that John, as well as Andrew, had been a follower of the Baptist;[3] at all events, the two families of Jonas and Zebedee seem to have been closely connected.[4] Salome, wife of Zebedee, was also strongly attached to Jesus, and accompanied him till his death.[5]

Women, in fact, received the new teacher very warmly. He had in their society those reserved manners which admit a very agreeable companionship in thought between the two sexes. The separation of men and women, which has prevented all finer development among the people of the East, was then no doubt, as in our day, much less strict in the rural districts and villages than in the large towns. Three or four devoted Galilean women always accompanied the youthful Master, and contended among themselves for the pleasure of listening to him and attending on him in turn.[6] These women brought into the new sect an element

[1] Matt. iv. 19; Mark i. 17; Luke v. 10.

[2] Mark i. 20; Luke v. 10 and viii. 3; John xix. 27.

[3] John i. 35–37. The mysterious way in which John is always spoken of in the Fourth Gospel seems to show that one of the disciples here unnamed is John himself.

[4] Matt. iv. 18–22; Luke v. 10; John i. 35–37 and xxi. 2, 3.

[5] Matt. xxvii. 56; Mark xv. 40; xvi. 1.

[6] Matt. xxvii. 55, 56; Mark xv. 40, 41; Luke viii. 2, 3, and xxiii. 49.

of enthusiasm as well as love of marvel, the importance of which was already felt. One of them, Mary of Magdala, who has made the name of her poor native town so famous in the world, appears to have been a person of peculiar excitability. In the language of the day, she had been possessed by "seven devils;"[1] that is to say, she had been afflicted with nervous and seemingly inexplicable maladies. Jesus, by his unspotted and gentle loveliness, quieted her disturbed temperament. The Magdalene remained faithful to him even to Calvary, and on the second day following his death played a most important part; for, as we shall see later on, she was the chief medium through which faith in the resurrection was confirmed. Joanna, wife of Chuza (one of the officers of Antipas), Susannah, and others who have remained unknown, constantly followed and served him.[2] Some of them were rich, and by their fortunes put the young prophet in a position to live without practising the trade he had followed till then.[3]

Many others followed Jesus habitually, and recognised him as their Master, — one Philip of Bethsaida; Nathanael, son of Tolmai (or Ptolemy) of Cana, a disciple of the first period;[4] and Matthew, probably the same who was the Xenophon of infant Christianity. He had, according to tradition, been a tax-collector;[5] and as such he handled the pen (*kalam*) more easily than the

[1] Mark xvi. 9; Luke viii. 2. Cf. Tobit iii. 8; vi. 14.

[2] Luke viii. 3; xxiv. 10.

[3] Luke viii. 3.

[4] John i. 44–47; xxi. 2. Nathanael may be plausibly identified with the apostle who appears in the lists as Bartholomew (Bar-Tolmai, or Bar-Tholomæus).

[5] Matt. ix. 9; x. 3.

others. Even then, possibly, he began to think of writing those discourses (*logia*) which are, in substance, what we know of the teachings of Jesus. Among the disciples are also mentioned Thomas (or Didymus),[1] who sometimes doubted, but was warm-hearted, and a man of generous temper;[2] one Lebbæus or Thaddæus; Simon the Zealot,[3] perhaps a disciple of Judas the Gaulonite, belonging to the party of the *Kenaïm*, already existing, which was soon to play so great a part in the affairs of the Jewish people; Joseph Barsaba, surnamed Justus; Matthias;[4] an unknown person named Aristion;[5] lastly Judas, son of Simon, of the town of Kerioth, the black sheep of the flock, who acquired such a terrible renown. He was, it appears, the only one of them who was not a Galilean: Kerioth was a town at the extreme south of the tribe of Judah,[6] a day's journey beyond Hebron.

We have seen that the family of Jesus was in general not well inclined towards him.[7] Nevertheless, James and Jude, his cousins, sons of Mary Cleophas,[8] became from that time his disciples; and Mary Cleo-

[1] Didymus (*twain*, or *twin*) is the Greek rendering of Thomas.

[2] John xi. 14; xx. 24–29.

[3] Matt. x. 4; Mark iii. 18; Luke vi. 15; Acts i. 43; Ebionite Gospel (Epiph. *Adv. hær.* xxx. 13).

[4] Acts i. 21–23; cf. Papias (Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* iii. 39).

[5] Papias (ibid.) calls him a disciple like the apostles, ascribes to him narrations respecting the discourses of Jesus, and associates him with "John the Elder." (See Introduction, p. 58.)

[6] Now Kuryetein, or Kereitein.

[7] The incident told in John xix. 25–27 [the adoption by John of the mother of Jesus] seems to imply that his own brothers stood aloof from him during all his public life. If we assume more than one James in the family circle, we may trace an allusion to the unfriendliness of "James the Lord's brother" in Galatians ii. 6, comparing i. 19 and ii. 9, 11.

[8] See *ante*, p. 95.

phas herself was one of the women who followed him to Calvary.[1] At this earlier period we do not find his mother with him. It is only after his death that Mary receives high consideration,[2] and that the disciples seek to attach her to themselves.[3] It is then, too, that the members of his family, as "brothers of the Lord," form an influential group, long at the head of the Church in Jerusalem,[4] which after the sack of the city sought refuge in Batanæa.[5] The simple fact of having been near him became a decisive advantage; just as, after the death of Mahomet, the wives and daughters of the Prophet, who were of no account during his lifetime, became great authorities.

In this friendly throng Jesus clearly had his preferences, and (so to speak) a smaller select circle. The two sons of Zebedee, James and John, appear to have taken the front rank in this little group. They were full of fire and passion. Jesus had with keen insight designated them "sons of thunder," on account of their excessive zeal, which, if it had held control of the thunderbolt, would have made too free a use of it.[6] John, above all, appears to have been on a special footing of something like familiarity with the Master. The school which afterward gathered about the younger

[1] Matt. xxvii. 56; Mark xv. 40; John xix. 25.

[2] Acts i. 14. Comp. Luke i. 28; ii. 25, which already show great respect for Mary.

[3] John xix. 25–27.

[4] See *ante*, p. 95.

[5] Julius Africanus, in Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* i. 7.

[6] Mark iii. 17; ix. 37–39; x. 35–40; and Luke ix. 49, 50, 54–56. The Apocalypse exhibits the same quality, especially in chaps. ii. and iii., in which personal animosity overflows. Compare the fanatic incident reported by Irenæus, *Adv. hær.* III. iii. 4 [regarding his bitter treatment of the heretic Cerinthus].

son of Zebedee, and wrote out his recollections (it appears) in a manner which did not at all disguise its own interests, has perhaps exaggerated the love that Jesus bore him.[1] But what is more significant is that in the Synoptical Gospels Simon Bar-Jona (or Peter), James the son of Zebedee, and John his brother form a sort of inner council, which Jesus summons at certain times when he distrusts the fidelity and good sense of the others.[2] It appears, besides, that all three were in partnership as fishermen.[3] The affection of Jesus for Peter was deep. The character of that disciple — upright, sincere, impulsive — pleased Jesus, who sometimes allowed himself to smile at his eager manner. Peter, who had little in him of the mystic, communicated to the Master his simple doubts, his dislikes, his human weaknesses,[4] with an honest unreserve which recalls that of the Sieur de Joinville toward Saint Louis, while Jesus would reprove him in a friendly manner full of confidence and esteem. As to John, his youth, his exquisite tenderness of heart, and his lively imagination must have possessed a great charm.[5] The individuality of this extraordinary man did not fully appear till afterwards. If he is not the author of the unique Gospel which bears his name, — which, though it misrepresents the character of Jesus in many points, con-

[1] John xiii. 23; xviii. 15; xix. 26, 27; xx. 2, 4; xxi. 7, 20–24.

[2] Matt. xvii. 1; xxvi. 37: Mark v. 37; ix. 1; xiii. 3; xiv. 33: Luke ix. 28. A notion very early prevailed that Jesus had imparted to these three disciples a secret doctrine, — a *gnosis*. It is remarkable that the Gospel ascribed to John never once mentions his brother James.

[3] Matt. iv. 18–22; Luke v. 10; John xxi. 2–8.

[4] Matt. xiv. 28; xvi. 22. Mark viii. 32, 33.

[5] He appears to have lived till about A. D. 100. See John xxi. 15–23, and the authorities in Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* iii. 20, 23. The Apocalypse was probably written by him. (See note 6 on the preceding page.)

tains such precious testimony, — it is at least possible that he made the first contribution towards it. Accustomed to ponder over his recollections with the feverish restlessness of an excited mind, he may have transfigured his Master while thinking to describe him, and thus furnished to skilful fabricators a pretext for composing a narrative in which entire good faith was by no means the guiding principle.

No hierarchy, strictly speaking, existed in this infant sect. All were to call each other "brothers," and Jesus absolutely forbade titles of superiority, such as "Master" (*rabbi*), or "Father," — since he alone was Master, God alone was Father, and the chief among them was to be the servant of all.[1] Meanwhile, Simon Bar-Jona is distinguished among his fellows by a certain personal importance. Jesus lived with him, and discoursed from his boat;[2] his house was the headquarters of the gospel proclamation. In public he was regarded as leader of the band, and to him the tax-collectors applied for payment of the sums due from the company.[3] Simon was the first to acknowledge Jesus to be the Messiah.[4] In a moment of unpopularity, when Jesus asked of his disciples, "Will you too go away?" Simon answered, "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life."[5] On various occasions Jesus assigned to Peter a certain priority in his Church,[6] and interpreted the Syriac surname *Kephas* ("stone") as meaning that he was the corner-stone of the new

[1] Matt. xviii. 4; xx. 25, 26; xxiii. 8–12. Mark ix. 34; x. 42–46.
[2] Luke v. 3.
[3] Matt. xvii. 24.
[4] Matt. xvi. 16, 17.
[5] John vi. 68–70.
[6] Matt. x. 2; Luke xxii. 32; John xxi. 15–19; Acts. i. ii. v. *et seq.*; Gal. i. 18, and ii. 7, 8.

building,[1] and at one time even seems to promise him "the keys of the kingdom of heaven," and to accord to him the right of pronouncing upon earth decisions which would always be ratified in the eternal world.[2]

No doubt the leadership assigned to Peter excited some slight jealousy. This jealousy was kindled particularly in view of the future, — of that kingdom of God in which all the disciples would be seated on thrones, at the right and the left of the Master, to judge the twelve tribes of Israel.[3] They asked among themselves who should then be nearest to the "Son of Man," acting in some sort as his first minister and associate. The two sons of Zebedee aspired to that rank. Filled with this thought, they put forward their mother Salome, who one day took Jesus aside, and solicited of him the two highest places for her sons.[4] Jesus put aside the request by his habitual maxim that he who exalts himself shall be brought low, and that the kingdom of heaven will be the possession of the humble. This created some stir in the band; and there was much ill-feeling against James and John.[5] The same rivalry seems to be implied in the Gospel ascribed to John, in which the assumed writer constantly declares himself to have been "the beloved disciple," to whom the Master in dying confided the care of his mother; while he continually seeks to place himself close to Simon Peter, sometimes before him,

[1] Matt. xvi. 18; John i. 42.

[2] Matt. xvi. 19. Elsewhere, it is true (Matt. xviii. 18), the same power is given to all the apostles.

[3] Matt. xviii. 1–4, 18–20; Mark x. 35–40; Luke ix. 46; xxii. 30.

[4] Matt. xx. 20–23; Mark x. 35–44.

[5] Mark x. 41.

in certain important situations where the earlier evangelists had left him out.[1]

Among the persons above mentioned, those of whom we know anything had begun life as fishermen. In a country of simple manners, where every one labours, this profession was not so very humble as the declamations of preachers have made it out, in order the better to magnify the miracle of the origin of Christianity. At all events, none of them belonged to a superior social class. Only one, Levi son of Alphæus, and perhaps the apostle Matthew, had been publicans.[2] But those to whom that name was given in Judæa were not the farmers-general [of the revenue], who were men of exalted rank (always Roman *equites*), called at Rome *publicani*.[3] They were the agents of the farmers-general, of a subordinate class, simple customs-officers. The great road from Acre to Damascus, one of the most ancient in the world, which traversed Galilee skirting the lake,[4] greatly increased the number of this class of officials there. At Capernaum, which was probably on

[1] John xviii. 15, 16; xix. 26, 27; xx. 2–4; xxi. 7, 20, 21. Compare i. 35–37, where one of the disciples not named is probably John.

[2] Matt. ix. 9; x. 3: Mark ii. 14; iii. 18: Luke v. 27; vi. 15: Acts i. 13: Ebion. Gosp. in Epiph. xxx. 13. The original account names "Levi son of Alphæus." The later compiler of the First Gospel substituted the name "Matthew," from a tradition of more or less weight that this apostle had exercised that charge (Matt. x. 3). In the Gospel as it now stands, we must remember, the only part that can be from the apostle consists of the discourses of Jesus. (See Papias in Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* iii. 34.)

[3] Cicero, *De provinc. consul.* 5; *Pro Plancio* 9; Tacitus, *Ann.* iv. 6; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xii. 32; Appian, *Bell. civ.* ii. 13.

[4] It continued famous down to the time of the Crusades, under the name of the "Seaway" (*via maris*): cf. Isaiah ix. 1; Matt. iv. 13–15; Tobit i. 1. The road cut in the rock near Ain-et-Tin, made (as I think) part of it, the highway thence turning toward the Bridge of the Daughters of Jacob, as to-day. Part of the road from Ain-et-Tin to this bridge is of ancient construction.

the highway, there was a numerous staff.[1] That occupation has never been popular; but among the Jews it was regarded as outright criminal. Taxation, which was new to them, was a sign of vassalage. One school, that of Judas the Gaulonite, maintained that to pay taxes was an act of heathenism. The customs-officers, accordingly, were abhorred by the zealots of the Law. They were only spoken of in company with assassins, highway robbers, and people of abandoned life.[2] Jews who accepted such positions were excommunicated and became incapable of making a will; their money was accursed, and the casuists forbade its being exchanged.[3] These poor people, under the ban of society, lived by themselves apart. Jesus accepted a dinner offered him by Levi, at which were present (in the language of the time) "many publicans and sinners." This was a great scandal.[4] In those houses of ill-repute one ran the risk of meeting evil society. We shall often see him thus, careless of shocking the prejudices of well-disposed persons, seeking to elevate the classes scorned by the orthodox, and so exposing himself to the most cutting reproaches of the devout. Pharisaism had made salvation the reward of an infinity of petty observances, and of a sort of outward respectability. The true moralist, who came to proclaim that God requires but one thing, — uprightness of heart, — must

[1] Matt. ix. 9–13.

[2] Matt. v. 46, 47; ix. 10, 11; xi. 19; xviii. 17; xxi. 31, 32. Mark ii. 15, 16. Luke v. 30; vii. 34; xv. 1; xviii. 11; xix. 7. Lucian, *Nekyomant.* 11. Dio Chrysost. *Orat.* iv. 85; xiv. 269 (ed. Emperius). Mishna, *Nedarim*, iii. 4.

[3] Mishna, *Baba kama*, x. 1; Jerusalem Talmud, *Demai*, ii. 3; Babylonian Talmud, *Sanhedrin*, 25 *b*.

[4] Luke v. 29–32.

needs be welcomed with benediction among all who were not spoiled by the official hypocrisy.

Jesus owed these numerous conquests to an infinite charm of person and of speech. One penetrating word, one glance falling upon a simple conscience which was only waiting to be aroused, made such a one an ardent disciple. Sometimes he made use of an innocent artifice, which was employed at a later period by Joan of Arc. He assumed a knowledge of some private matter touching the person he wished to gain over, or he would recall some circumstance dear to that person's heart. In this manner he is said to have touched Nathanael, Peter, and the woman of Samaria.[1] Dissimulating the real source of his power, — I mean his superiority to his surroundings, — he allowed it to be believed, in order to meet the ideas of the time (which he fully shared), that a revelation from on high uncovered secret things, and opened men's hearts to him. Everybody imagined that he lived in a sphere inaccessible to other men. It was said that he spoke with Moses and Elijah upon the mountains;[2] it was believed that in his hours of solitude angels came to pay him homage, and established a supernatural intercourse between him and heaven.[3]

[1] John i. 42, 43, 48–50; iv. 17–19: cf. Mark ii. 8; iii. 2–4; and John ii. 24, 25.

[2] Matt. xvii. 3; Mark ix. 3; Luke ix. 30, 31.

[3] Matt. iv. 11; Mark i. 13.

CHAPTER X.

PREACHINGS ON THE LAKESIDE.

Such was the group which gathered about Jesus on the lake-shore of Tiberias. The aristocracy was represented there by a customs-officer and a steward's wife; the others were mostly fishermen and common people. They were extremely ignorant, — people of slender intelligence, who believed in apparitions and spirits.[1] Not one particle of Greek culture had penetrated this original company; their Jewish instruction was also very imperfect; but they were full of heart and good-will. The fine climate of Galilee rendered the existence of these honest fishermen a continual delight. They were true pioneers of the kingdom of God, — simple, good, happy; rocked gently on their charming little lake, or sleeping at night upon its shore. One cannot realise the intoxication of a life which thus glides away under the canopy of heaven; the glow, both soft and strong, produced by this perpetual contact with Nature; the dreams of those nights in the clear starlight, under the boundless depth of an azure dome. It was during such a night that Jacob, with his head resting on a stone, beheld in the stars the promise of a countless posterity, and the mysterious ladder between heaven and earth by which the Elohim came and went. At the time of Jesus the sky was not yet shut, or the

[1] Matt. xiv. 26; Mark vi. 49; Luke xxiv. 39; John vi. 19.

earth grown cold. The cloud still opened above the Son of Man; angels ascended and descended upon his head;[1] everywhere were visions of the kingdom of God, for man bore them in his heart. The clear, mild eyes of those simple souls contemplated the universe in its ideal source; the world perhaps unveiled its secret to the conscience, divinely clear, of these happy children, whose purity of heart deserved that one day they should be received before the face of God.

Jesus lived with his disciples almost always in the open air. Sometimes he entered a boat, and taught the multitudes gathered on the shore.[2] Sometimes he would sit upon the hills that skirt the lake, where the air is so pure and the sky so bright. The faithful band led thus a gay and roaming life, gathering the inspirations of the Master in their early bloom. An innocent doubt might now and then be raised, some question mildly sceptical; but a smile or a look from Jesus would silence the objection. At each step — in the passing cloud, in the sprouting seed, in the yellowing grain — they beheld a sign of the kingdom now ready to appear; they were just about to see God, they thought, and to become masters of the world. Tears were turned into joy; it was the coming upon earth of peace to every heart. And the Master spoke these words: —

Blessed are the poor in spirit; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

Blessed are they that mourn; for they shall be comforted.

Blessed are the meek; for they shall inherit the earth.

Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness; for they shall be filled.

[1] John i. 51.

[2] Matt. xiii. 1, 2. Mark iii. 9; iv. 1. Luke v. 3.

Blessed are the merciful; for they shall obtain mercy.

Blessed are the pure in heart; for they shall see God.

Blessed are the peace-makers; for they shall be called the children of God.

Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.[1]

His discourse was mild and gentle, redolent of Nature and of the perfume of the fields. He loved the flowers, and drew from them his most charming lessons. The birds of the air, the sea, the mountains, the sports of children, found their way by turn into his instructions. His style had nothing of the Greek period about it; it had much more the turn of the Hebrew parable, in particular such sentences of the Jewish doctors, his contemporaries, as we read in the *Pirké Aboth*. His comments were very brief; they formed a sort of *surates*, after the manner of the Koran, which, afterwards put together, made up the long discourses written out by Matthew.[2] No formal transition linked together these diverse fragments; but the same inspiration generally pervaded them all, and gave them unity. In the parable, especially, the Master was at his best. Nothing in Judaism had given him the model of this delightful method;[3] it was a creation of his own. No doubt there are to be found in Buddhist books some parables of precisely the same tone and fashion as the Gospel parables;[4] but it is

[1] Matt. v. 3–10; Luke vi. 20–25.

[2] These are the "Lord's discourses" (λόγια κυριακά) spoken of by Papias in Eusebius (iii. 39).

[3] The apologue, such as we find it in Judges ix. 8–15 [the bramble] and 2 Sam. xii. 1–6 [the ewe-lamb], has only a formal likeness to the Gospel parable, whose real originality is in the feeling that runs through it. The parables of the *Midraschin* are also of quite another spirit.

[4] For example, the "Lotus of the true Law," i. and iv.

hard to allow that a Buddhist influence had any effect on these. The gentle temper and depth of feeling which alike animated primitive Christianity and Buddhism are perhaps enough to explain these similarities.

A total indifference to outward things and to those vain superfluities of dress and furnishing required by our sombre skies was the outcome of the simple and easy way of life in Galilee. Cold climates, by bringing man and the outer world into perpetual conflict, give great value to contrivances for comfort. On the other hand, the regions which waken few desires are those of idealism and poetry. The accessories of life are here insignificant, as compared with the pure delight of life itself. Adornment of the dwelling is here superfluous, for people keep in-doors as little as possible. The hearty and regular diet of less generous climates would be looked upon as heavy and disagreeable; and as for the luxury of clothing, what can vie with that which God has given to the earth and to the birds of heaven? Labour in such climates seems needless; what it yields is not worth what it costs. The beasts of the field are better clad than the richest man, and they toil not. This contempt, when it does not proceed from indolence, greatly aids to elevate the souls of men; and it inspired Jesus with some charming apologues: —

Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal; but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal: for where your treasure is, there will your heart be also.

No man can serve two masters; for either he will hate the

one and love the other, or else he will hold to the one and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and Mammon.

Therefore I say unto you, Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink, nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on: is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment?

Behold the fowls of the air; for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns, yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they? Which of you by taking thought can add one cubit to his stature?

And why take ye thought for raiment? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow: they toil not, neither do they spin; and yet I say unto you, that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass of the field, which to-day is, and to-morrow will be cast into the fire, shall he not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith?

Therefore take no thought, saying, What shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed? — for after all these things do the Gentiles seek — for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things. But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you.

Take therefore no thought for the morrow; for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof.[1]

This essentially Galilean tone of feeling had a decisive influence upon the destinies of the growing sect. The happy band, trusting to its heavenly Father for all it needed to supply its wants, made it the first rule to look on the cares of life as an evil, which stifles in man the germ of all good.[2] Each day it asks of God

[1] Matt. vi. 19–34; Luke xii. 22–34; and xvi. 13. Compare the precepts in Luke x. 7, 8 — expressed with the same simplicity — with the Babylonian Talmud, *Sota*, 48 *b*.

[2] Matt. xiii. 22; Mark iv. 19; Luke viii. 14.

bread for the morrow.[1] Wherefore lay up treasure? the kingdom of God is at hand. "Sell that ye have and give alms," said the Master; "provide yourselves bags which wax not old, a treasure in the heavens that faileth not."[2] What more senseless than to heap up treasures for heirs one shall never see?[3] As an example of human folly, Jesus liked to tell the case of a man who, when he had enlarged his barns and laid up goods for many years, died before enjoying them.[4] Brigandage, which was deeply rooted in Galilee,[5] added much force to this view of life. The poor man, who did not suffer from it, must regard himself as the favoured of God; while the man of wealth, so insecure in his possessions, was the one really disinherited. In our communities, built on a very strict idea of property, the poor man's situation is terrible: he has literally no spot of his own under the sun. There are no flowers, no grass, no shade, except for the owner of the soil. In the Orient these things are gifts of God, which belong to no one. The landlord has but a slender privilege; Nature is the patrimony of all.

Further, Christianity at its birth only followed in this the footsteps of the Jewish sects that practised the monastic life. A communistic element was the soul of all those sects (Essenes, Therapeutæ), which were looked upon with equal disfavour by Pharisee and Sadducee. The messianic faith, which among the orthodox Jews was wholly political, came among them to be purely

[1] Matt. vi. 11; Luke xi. 3. This is the meaning of "daily bread," *ἐπι-ούσιος*.

[2] Luke xii. 33, 34. Compare the fine maxims, much like these, which the Talmud puts in the mouth of Monobarus (Jerusalem Talmud, *Peah*, 15 *b*).

[3] Luke xii. 20. [4] Luke xii. 16–19.

[5] Josephus, *Antiq.* XVII. x. 4, 5; *Life*, 11, 12.

social. By an easy, regular, and contemplative mode of life, leaving its share to each man's freedom, these small churches — which have been supposed (not wrongly, perhaps) to imitate in some degree the neo-Pythagorean customs — thought to inaugurate on earth the kingdom of heaven. Dreams of a blessed life, founded upon the brotherhood of men and pure worship of the true God, engrossed the loftier souls, and led everywhere to bold and sincere attempts, though to small results.[1]

Jesus, whose relations with the Essenes it is very difficult to make out (since likeness does not always imply historical connection), was in this unquestionably a brother with them. Community of goods was for some time the rule in the new society.[2] Avarice was the cardinal sin.[3] Now, it is to be noted that the sin of "avarice," against which Christian morality has been so severe, was then the mere attachment to property. The first condition of being a perfect disciple of Jesus was to sell one's goods and give the money to the poor. Those who recoiled from that step might not enter the community.[4] Jesus often repeated that he who finds the kingdom of God must buy it at the sacrifice of all his goods, and that in doing so he makes a profitable exchange.

The kingdom of heaven is like a treasure hid in a field; which when a man hath found he hideth, and for joy thereof goeth and selleth all that he hath, and buyeth that field.

[1] Philo, *Quod omnis bonus liber*, *De vita contemplativa*. Josephus, *Antiq.* XVIII. i. 5; *Wars*, II. viii. 2–13. Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* v. 17; Epiphan. *Adv. hær.* x. xix. xxix. 5.

[2] Acts iv. 32, 34–37; v. 1–11.

[3] Matt. xiii. 22; Luke xii. 15–21.

[4] Matt. xix. 21; Mark x. 21, 22, 28–30; Luke xviii. 22, 23, 28.

The kingdom of heaven is like a merchant-man seeking goodly pearls; who when he had found one pearl of great price went and sold all that he had, and bought it.[1]

But, alas! the inconveniences of this method were not long in making themselves felt. A treasurer was required, and Judas of Kerioth was chosen for the office. Rightly or wrongly, he was accused of stealing from the common purse;[2] a great weight of odium was heaped against him, and he came to an evil end.

Sometimes the Master, better versed in heavenly things than in those of earth, taught a political economy yet more remarkable. In a strange parable, a steward is praised for having made friends among the poor [debtors] at the expense of his employer, so that the poor in their turn might introduce him into the kingdom of heaven. Since, in fact, the poor must be the dispensers of this kingdom, they will not admit any one to it excepting those who have given them something. A discreet man, thinking of the future, must therefore seek to win their favour. "The Pharisees, who were covetous," says the evangelist, "heard all these things, and they derided him."[3] Did they also hear the appalling parable which follows?

There was a certain rich man, who was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day; and there was a certain beggar named Lazarus, who was laid at his gate full of sores, and desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table; moreover, the dogs came and licked his sores. And it came to pass that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom. The rich man also died, and was buried. And in

[1] Matt. xiii. 44–46. [2] John xii. 6.
[3] Luke xvi. 1–14.

hell[1] he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and saw Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom; and he cried and said, Father Abraham, have pity on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water and cool my tongue, for I am tormented in this flame. But Abraham said, My son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy portion of good, and likewise Lazarus his portion of evil; but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented.[2]

What could be more just? Later on, this was called the parable of the "wicked rich man." But it is purely and simply the parable of the "rich man." He is in hell because he is rich, because he does not give his goods to the poor, because he dines well, while they at his door have meagre fare. Finally, in a less exaggerated strain, while urging the duty of selling all and giving to the poor only as a "counsel of perfection," Jesus adds these terrible words: "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God."[3]

Jesus, as well as the band of joyous children who accompanied him, was controlled in all this by a profound and admirable sentiment which has made him ever since the true source of the soul's peace, and the great comforter of man's life. In disengaging men

[1] *Hades*, the realm of the departed.

[2] Luke xvi. 19–25. Luke, as we see (compare vi. 20, 21, 25, 26), has a very marked leaning to communism, and has, no doubt, exaggerated this trait in the teaching of Jesus. But it is also sufficiently pronounced in Matthew's λόγια.

[3] Matt. xix. 24; Mark x. 25; Luke xviii. 25; Gospel of Hebrews: Hilgenfeld, *N. T. extra can. rec.* iv. 17. This proverbial phrase is found in the Talmud (Babylonian, *Berakoth*, 55 *b*; *Baba metsia*, 38 *b*) and the Koran (Sura, vii. 38). Origen and the Greek expositors, not knowing the Semitic proverb, have wrongly taken the word to mean a *cable* (κάμιλος). [The "needle's eye" is said to be a name given to the narrow gateway of an Eastern caravansary or courtyard, impassable to the laden beast of burden.]

from what he called "the cares of this world," he might go to excess, and strike at conditions essential to human society; but he created that lofty spirituality which for centuries has filled souls with joy in passing through this vale of tears. He saw with perfect clearness that the heedlessness of man, his lack of reason and morality, come oftenest from the distractions he yields to, from the cares that assail him, multiplied beyond measure as they are by civilisation.[1] In this way the gospel has been the supreme remedy for the weariness of vulgar life, a perpetual uplifting of the heart, a powerful relief from the wretched cares of the world, a gentle appeal like that of Jesus to the ear of Martha: "Martha, Martha, thou art careful and troubled about many things; but one thing is needful." Thanks to him, existence the most gloomy, the most absorbed by sad or humiliating duties, has had its way of escape to a nook of heaven. In our overburdened civilisations, the memory of the free life led in Galilee has been like perfume from another world, like the "dew of Hermon,"[2] which has prevented barrenness and vulgarity from blasting utterly the field of God.

[1] Matt. xiii. 22.

[2] Psalm cxxxiii. 3.

CHAPTER XI.

THE KINGDOM OF THE POOR.

These maxims, good for a country in which life is nurtured by air and light, — that mild communism of a band of God's children leaning with confidence on the bosom of their Father, — might suit a simple sect, fully convinced that its dreams were about to be realised; but it is evident that such principles could not rally society as a whole to their support. Jesus, in fact, soon perceived that the official world would by no means enlist for his kingdom. He therefore chose his course with extreme boldness. Putting aside the world, with its unfeeling heart and its narrow prejudices, he turned to the common people. A complete change of ranks must take place. The kingdom of God is made, first, for children and for those in temper like them; second, for the outcast of this world, victims of that social arrogance which repels the good though humble man; third, for heretics and schismatics, publicans, Samaritans, and Pagans of Tyre and Sidon. A forcible parable explained and justified this appeal to the people.[1] A king has prepared a wedding feast, and sends his servants to seek out those that are invited. Each one of the invited excuses himself; some even maltreat the messengers. The king thereupon takes high ground. The well-to-do have rejected his invita-

[1] Matt. xxii. 2–14; Luke xiv. 16–24 : cf. Matt. viii. 11, 12; xxi. 33-41.

tion: be it so; he will have the first comers instead, people collected from highways and byways, the poor, the beggars, the lame, — it matters not; the room must be filled. "I assure you," says the king, "that none of those men who were bidden shall so much as taste of my supper."

Pure Ebionism — that is to say, the doctrine that the poor (*ebionim*) alone shall be saved; that the kingdom of the poor is at hand — was accordingly the doctrine of Jesus. "Woe unto you that are rich," said he, "for ye have received your consolation. Woe unto you that are full, for ye shall hunger. Woe unto you that laugh now, for ye shall mourn and weep."[1] He said, again, "When thou makest a dinner or a supper, call not thy friends nor thy brethren, neither thy kinsmen nor thy rich neighbours, lest they also bid thee again, and a recompense be made thee. But when thou makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind, and thou wilt be blessed in that they cannot repay thee; for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just."[2] In a like sense, perhaps, he would often repeat, "Be prudent bankers;"[3] that is to say, make good investments for the kingdom of God, by giving your wealth to the poor, and thus fulfil the old proverb, "A gift to the poor is a loan to God" (Prov. xix. 17).

But this was no new thing. The most intense democratic movement in the memory of man — the only one, too, that has succeeded, for it alone has kept itself within the domain of pure thought — had long agi-

[1] Luke vi. 24, 25. [2] Luke xiv. 12-14.

[3] A saying preserved by a very ancient and constant tradition: see the Clementine Homilies, ii. 51, iii. 50, xviii. 20; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* i. 28. It is found also in Origen, Jerome, and many Fathers of the Church.

tated the Jewish race. The thought that God is the avenger of the poor and weak against the rich and powerful is found on every page of the Old Testament. The history of Israel is, of all histories, that in which popular feeling has most constantly prevailed. The Prophets — orators of the people, and, we may say, the boldest of popular orators — had thundered incessantly against the great, and had closely associated the terms "rich, impious, violent, wicked," on the one hand, and "poor, gentle, humble, pious," on the other.[1] Under the Seleucidæ, when the aristocracy had almost all apostatised and gone over to Hellenism, these associations of ideas were but strengthened. The Book of Enoch contains even fiercer maledictions than those of the Gospels against the world, the rich and the powerful.[2] In this book luxury is held up as a crime. "The Son of Man," in that strange apocalypse, dethrones kings, drags them away from their voluptuous life, and plunges them into hell.[3] The initiation of Judæa into profane life, the recent introduction of a purely worldly element of luxury and comfort, provoked a violent reaction in favour of patriarchal simplicity. "Woe to you who despise the humble dwelling and inheritance of your fathers! Woe to you who build your palaces with others' sweat! Each stone, each brick it is built of, is a sin."[4] The word "poor" (*ebion*) had become a synonym of "saint," or "friend of God." This was the name the Galilean disciples of Jesus loved to claim: it was long

[1] See especially Amos ii. 6; Isaiah lxiii. 9; Psalms xxv. 9, xxxvii. 11, and lxix. 33; also the Hebrew lexicon under the words עריץ, היללים, אביון .דל, ענני, ענו, חסיד עשיר (*ebion*).

[2] Chaps. lxii. lxiii. xcvii. c. civ.

[3] Chap. xlvi. 4–8 (possibly a Christian interpolation).

[4] Enoch xcix. 13, 14.

the name given to the Judaising Christians of Batanæa and of the Hauran (Nazarenes, Hebrews), who remained faithful to the language as well as to the earlier teachings of Jesus, and who boasted of having among them the descendants of his family.[1] At the end of the second century these devout sectaries, who lived apart from the great current that had carried away the other churches, were treated as heretics (*Ebionites*); and to explain their name a pretended heresiarch, Ebion, was invented.[2]

We may see, at a glance, that this exaggerated esteem for poverty could not last long. It was one of those utopian elements always found at the origin of great movements, to be rectified by time. Thrown into the broad sweep of human society, Christianity must easily consent in course of time to receive wealth into her bosom, — just as Buddhism, at first exclusively monastical, so soon as conversions multiplied, brought itself to admit the laity. But the birthmark ever remains. Though quickly outgrown and forgotten, Ebionism left a leaven in the whole history of Christian institutions, which was never lost. The collection of the discourses (*logia*) of Jesus was made, or at least completed, in the Ebionite churches of Batanæa.[3] "Poverty" remained an ideal which the true lineage of Jesus never

[1] Julius Africanus in Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* i. 7; Euseb. *De situ et nom. loc. hebr.* under Χωβά; Origen *c. Celsum*, ii. 1, and v. 61; Epiphan. xxix. 7, 9, and xxx. 2, 18.

[2] See especially Origen *c. Celsum*, ii. 1; *De principiis*, iv. 22 (cf. Epiphan. xxx. 17). Irenæus, Origen, Eusebius, and the Apostolical Constitutions know of no such person. The author of the *Philosophumena* [Hippolytus] seems to hesitate (vii. 34, 35; x. 22, 23). The imaginary Ebion gained currency through Tertullian, and still more through Epiphanius. All the Fathers are agreed as to the etymology: Ἐβίων = πτωχός.

[3] Epiphan. xix. xxix. xxx. (especially xxix. 9).

afterward forsook. To possess nothing was the true life of the gospel; mendicancy became a virtue, a holy condition. The great Franciscan (Umbrian) movement of the thirteenth century, which among all attempts at religious construction most resembles that in Galilee, was wholly made in the name of poverty. Francis of Assisi, who more than any other man resembled Jesus in his exquisite goodness, his delicate, pure, and tender communion with universal life, was a poor man. The mendicant orders, the numberless communistic mediæval sects, — Poor Men of Lyons, Beghards, Good Men, Minor Brethren, Downtrodden, Poor Gospellers, Disciples of the Eternal Gospel, — claimed to be, and in fact were, the true disciples of Jesus. But here again the most impracticable dreams of the new religion were fertile in results. Pious mendicity, so impatiently borne by our industrial and orderly communities, was in its day and in a fitting climate full of charm. It offered to a multitude of mild and contemplative souls the only condition suited to them. To have made poverty an object of love and desire, — to have lifted the beggar to the altar, and sanctified the poor man's garb, — was a master-stroke which political economy may not be greatly moved by; but in its presence the true moralist cannot remain indifferent. Humanity, in order to bear its burden, needs to believe that its reward is not wholly measured by its wage. The greatest service that can be rendered it is to teach it the lesson that it lives not by bread alone.

Like all great men, Jesus liked the people, and felt himself at home with them. The gospel, in his thought of it, is made for the poor; it is to them he brings the glad tidings of salvation.[1] All those despised by

[1] Matt. x. 23, and xi. 5; Luke vi. 20, 21.

orthodox Judaism were his chosen ones. Love of the people and pity for their weakness — the sentiment of the democratic leader, who feels the spirit of the multitude living in him, and knows himself to be its natural interpreter — shine forth at each moment in his acts and words.[1]

The chosen flock displayed, in fact, a very mixed character, and one likely to astonish rigid moralists. It counted in its fold persons with whom a self-respecting Jew would not have associated.[2] Perhaps Jesus found in this society, outside the common rules, more mind and heart than in a pedantic and formal middle-class, proud of its show-morality. The Pharisees, exaggerating the Mosaic precepts, had come to believe themselves defiled by contact with men less strict than themselves; in their meals they almost rivalled the senseless distinctions of caste in India. Jesus, despising these pitiful aberrations of religious sentiment, loved to eat with those who suffered by them.[3] Beside him at table were to be found persons said to have led evil lives, perhaps merely because they did not share the follies of the false devotees. The Pharisees and doctors cried out upon the scandal: "See," said they, "what men he eats with!" Jesus returned apt answers, which exasperated the hypocrites: "It is not the well who need a physician."[4] Or, again: "Does not a shepherd who has a hundred sheep, if he should lose one of them, leave the ninety-nine in the wilderness, and go after that which is lost until he find it? And when he has found it he brings it on his shoulders, rejoicing."[5] Or, again:

[1] Matt. ix. 36; Mark vi. 34.

[2] Matt. ix. 10–13; Luke xv. 1 [the lost sheep, and the prodigal son].

[3] Matt. ix. 11; Mark ii. 16; Luke v. 30.

[4] Matt. ix. 12.

[5] Luke xv. 4–7.

"The Son of Man is come to save that which was lost."[1] Or, once more: "I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners."[2] Lastly, that delightful parable of the prodigal son, in which he who has fallen is introduced as having a sort of privilege of love over him who has always been dutiful. Weak or guilty women, surprised at so much charm, and feeling for the first time the winning touch of virtue, approached him freely. People were astonished that he did not repulse them: "Oh!" said these austere puritans among themselves, "this man is no prophet; for if he were he would know what manner of woman it is that touches him, for she is a sinner." Jesus rejoins with the parable of a creditor who forgives his debtors' unequal debts; and he does not hesitate to prefer the lot of him to whom the greater debt was remitted.[3] He valued qualities of soul only in proportion to the love contained therein. Women with sorrowful hearts, disposed by their frailties to feelings of humility, were nearer to his kingdom than ordinary natures, such as deserve little credit for not having fallen. On the other hand, we can conceive that these tender souls, finding in their conversion to the sect an easy way to regain their standing, would passionately attach themselves to him.

Far from seeking to allay the murmurs raised by his disdain for the social susceptibilities of the time,

[1] Matt. xviii. 11; Luke xix. 10. [2] Matt. ix. 13.

[3] Luke vii. 37–50. Luke is fond of putting in relief all that refers to the pardon of sinners: see x. 30–35; xv. xvii. 16–19; xviii. 10–14; xix. 2–10; xxiii. 39–43. The story of the supper at Simon's house has been combined with that of the anointing which took place at Bethany a few days before the death of Jesus. But the pardon of the "woman that was a sinner" is an essential feature in the anecdotes of his life: compare John viii. 3–11; Papias in Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* iii. 39.

he seemed to take pleasure in provoking them. Never did any one avow more loftily that contempt for the "world," which is the first condition of great deeds and great originality. He pardoned the rich man only when the rich man, because of some prejudice, was disliked by society.[1] He openly preferred people of questionable lives, who had little consideration in the eyes of the orthodox leaders. "Publicans and harlots," he said to such, "will go into the kingdom of God before you. For you did not believe John when he came to you; but the publicans and the harlots believed him."[2] We can understand how galling the reproach of not having followed the good example set by prostitutes would be to men making a profession of seriousness and strict morality.

Jesus had no outward affectation or show of austerity. He did not shrink from pleasure; he went willingly to marriage feasts. One of his miracles was wrought, it is said, to enliven a wedding feast at a small village. In the East, weddings take place in the evening. Each person carries a lamp; and the lights coming and going make a very pretty sight. Jesus liked these gay and animated scenes, and drew parables from them.[3] Such conduct, compared with that of John the Baptist, gave offence.[4] One day, when the disciples of John and the Pharisees were keeping fast, it was asked, "How is it that while the disciples of John and of the Pharisees fast, yours eat and drink?" "Let them alone," said he; "would you have the bridegroom's companions fast while he is still with them? But the time will come when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them,

[1] Luke xix. 2–10.
[2] Matt. xxi. 31, 32.
[3] Matt. xxv. 1–23.
[4] Mark ii. 18; Luke v. 33.

and then they will fast."[1] His mild gaiety found continual expression in lively reflections and kindly pleasantries. "To what," said he, "shall I liken the men of this generation? They are like children sitting in the public square, calling to their fellows, and saying, 'Here we are singing to you, but you will not dance; we are mourning to you, and you will not weep.'[2] John came neither eating nor drinking, and you say, 'He is a madman.' The Son of Man is come eating and drinking, and you say, 'This is a glutton, a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners.' Here, again, wisdom is justified by her deeds."[3]

Jesus' passage through Galilee was thus a perpetual holiday. He rode on a mule, — in the East a creature very good and safe, whose large dark eye, shaded by long lashes, gives it an air of great gentleness. His disciples sometimes displayed around him a kind of rustic pomp, at the expense of their garments, which served as rugs. They would put them on the mule that carried him, or spread them on the earth in his path.[4] When he entered a house it was a joy and a benediction. He would halt in the villages and at the large farms, where he received an eager hospitality. In the East, the house a stranger enters becomes at once a public place. All the village assembles there; the children besiege it: the servants drive them off,

[1] Matt. ix. 14–17; Mark ii. 18–22; Luke v. 33–35.

[2] Words referring to some childish game.

[3] That is, "the act speaks for itself." Matt. xi. 16–19; Luke vii. 32–35. The proverb means that "men are blind; the works of God are made known by the works themselves." (Read ἔργων, not τέκνων, following the Vatican MS. *B*, and the *Cod. Sinaït.* The reading in Matthew was probably corrected from that in Luke, which seemed easier.)

[4] Matt. xxi. 7, 8.

but they keep coming back. Jesus could not suffer these innocent auditors to be roughly treated; he made them come to him, and embraced them.[1] The mothers, encouraged by such treatment, brought him their nurslings in order that he might touch them.[2] Women came to pour oil upon his head and perfumes on his feet. His disciples sometimes repulsed them as an annoyance; but Jesus, who loved ancient usages and everything that shows simplicity of heart, set right the ill done by his too zealous friends. He protected those who wished to honour him.[3] In this way children and women came to adore him. The reproach of alienating from their families these gentle creatures, always ready to be led astray, was one of the most frequent charges of his enemies.[4]

The youthful religion was thus in many respects a movement of women and children. The children were like a juvenile guard around Jesus for the inauguration of his innocent royalty, and offered him little ovations which much pleased him, calling him "son of David," crying *Hosanna*,[5] and bearing palms before him. Jesus, like Savonarola, perhaps made them serve as instruments for pious missions: he was very glad to see these young apostles, who did not compromise him, rush to the front and give him titles which he dared

[1] Matt. xix. 13–15; Mark ix. 36, 37; Luke xviii. 15, 16.

[2] Mark x. 13–16; Luke. xviii. 15.

[3] Matt. xxvi. 7–13; Mark xiv. 3–9; Luke vii. 37–50.

[4] See Marcion's addition to Luke xxiii. 2, in Epiphan. xlii. 11. If Marcion's omissions are without critical importance, it is not so with his additions, when they proceed, not from his prepossessions, but from the state of the manuscripts he used.

[5] The cry uttered in the processions at the Feast of Tabernacles, with the waving of palms (Mishna, *Sukka*, iii. 9), — a still existing custom.

not take for himself. He let them speak, and when he was asked if he heard, he replied evasively that the praise which falls from young lips is the most agreeable to God.[1] He lost no opportunity of repeating that the little ones are sacred beings;[2] that the kingdom of God belongs to children;[3] that we must become children to enter it;[4] that we ought to receive it as a child;[5] that the Heavenly Father hides his secrets from the wise, and reveals them to babes.[6] The notion of disciples in his mind is almost synonymous with that of children.[7] Once, when the disciples had one of those quarrels for precedence which were not uncommon, Jesus took a little child, placed him in the midst of them, and said, "This is the greatest: whoever shall humble himself as this little child, he is greatest in the kingdom of heaven."[8]

It was childhood, in fact, in its divine freshness, in its simple bewilderments of joy, which took possession of the earth. Every one believed that at any moment the kingdom so much desired might appear. Each one already saw himself seated on a throne[9] beside the Master. They divided the places among themselves;[10] they strove to reckon the precise date of its advent. This was called the "Glad Tidings": the doctrine had no other name. An old word, "paradise" (borrowed by the Hebrew, as by all Eastern languages, from the Persian), which first denoted the parks of the Persian

[1] Matt. xxi. 15, 16. [2] Matt. xviii. 5, 10, 14; Luke xvii. 2.
[3] Matt. xix. 14; Mark x. 14; Luke xviii. 16.
[4] Matt. xviii. 1–6; Mark ix. 33–41; Luke ix. 46.
[5] Mark x. 15. [6] Matt. xi. 25; Luke x. 21.
[7] Matt. x. 42; xviii. 5, 14; Mark ix. 36; Luke xvii. 2.
[8] Matt. xviii. 4; Mark ix. 33–36; Luke ix. 46–48.
[9] Luke xxii. 30. [10] Mark x. 37, 40, 41.

kings, summed up the general dream, — a delightful garden, in which the charming life led here below would be continued forever.[1]

How long did this intoxication last? We do not know. No one, during the course of this magic apparition, measured time any more than we measure a dream. Duration was suspended: a week was as an age. But, whether it filled years or months, the dream was so beautiful that humanity has lived upon it ever since, and it is still our consolation to inhale its diluted fragrance. Never did so much joy expand the heart of man. For one moment, in the most vigorous effort she ever made to rise above the world, humanity forgot the leaden weight which fastens her to earth, and the sorrows of the life below. Happy he who could see with his own eyes this divine unfolding, and share, though but for a day, this unexampled vision! But more happy still, Jesus would say to us, is he who, freed from all illusion, shall reproduce in himself the celestial vision, and, with no millenarian dream, no chimerical paradise, no signs in the heavens, but by the uprightness of his motive and the poetry of his soul, shall be able to create anew in his heart the true kingdom of God!

[1] Luke xxiii. 43; 2 Cor. xii. 4; *Carm. Sibyll.* procem. 86; Babylonian Talmud, *Chagiga*, 14 *b*.

CHAPTER XII.

JOHN IN PRISON.

While joyous Galilee was celebrating in feasts the coming of the well-beloved, John in his prison of Machærus was sadly pining with expectation and desire. He had learned the success of the young master whom he had seen some months before among his hearers. It was said that the Messiah predicted by the Prophets, he who was to restore the kingdom to Israel, had come, and was making known his presence in Galilee by marvellous works. John wished to inquire into the truth of this rumour, and as he communicated freely with his disciples, he chose two of them to go to Jesus in Galilee.[1]

The two disciples found Jesus at the height of his fame. The festal air that reigned around him surprised them. Accustomed to fasting, to constant prayer, and to a life full of aspirations, they were astonished to find themselves transported suddenly amidst the joys of welcome.[2] They told Jesus their message: "Art thou he that should come? Or shall we look for another?" Jesus, who now scarce hesitated any longer respecting his proper rank as Messiah, recounted to them the works which were to characterise the coming of the kingdom of God, — healing of the sick, and the

[1] Matt. xi. 2–11; Luke vii. 18–23.

[2] Matt. ix. 14–17.

glad tidings of a salvation near at hand announced to the poor. These were the works he wrought. "And happy is he," said Jesus, "who shall have no doubt concerning me."

We do not know whether this answer found John the Baptist still alive, or into what temper it threw the austere ascetic. Did he die consoled, and certain that he whom he had announced already lived; or did he retain some doubts as to the mission of Jesus? There is nothing to inform us. Seeing, however, that his school continued to run its course side by side with the Christian churches, we are led to think that, notwithstanding his esteem for Jesus, John did not regard him as having realised the divine promises. Death came, moreover, to cut short his doubts. The untamable freedom of the ascetic was to crown his restless and troubled career by the only end worthy of it.

The indulgence which Antipas had at first shown towards John could not endure long. In the interviews which (according to the Christian tradition) John had had with the tetrarch, he did not cease repeating to him that his marriage was unlawful, and that he ought to put Herodias away.[1] We can easily imagine the hatred which the granddaughter of Herod the Great must have cherished against this importunate counsellor. She only waited an opportunity to destroy him. Her daughter Salome, born of her first marriage, ambitious and dissolute like her mother, entered into her designs. That year (probably A. D. 30) Antipas chanced to be at Machærus on his birthday. Herod the Great had constructed within the fortress a magnificent palace, in which the tetrarch frequently resided. Here he gave

[1] Matt. xiv. 4, 5; Mark vi. 18, 19; Luke iii. 19.

a great feast, during which Salome executed one of those character-dances which are not considered in Syria as unbecoming a distinguished person. Antipas, greatly delighted, asked her what she most desired; and she, at a hint from her mother, replied, "Give me here John the Baptist's head upon this trencher."[1] Antipas was sorry, but he would not refuse. A guard took the dish, went and cut off the prisoner's head, and brought it to him.[2]

The disciples of the Baptist obtained his body and placed it in a tomb. The people were much offended. Six years later, Hâreth attacked Antipas, in order to recover Machærus and to avenge the dishonour of his daughter: Antipas was completely beaten, and his defeat was generally regarded as a punishment for the murder of John.[3]

News of the Baptist's death was brought by his disciples to Jesus.[4] The last step which John had taken in regard to Jesus had resulted in establishing a close attachment between the two schools. Jesus, fearing an increase of ill-will on the part of Antipas, took the precaution to retire to the desert, whither many people followed him.[5] By strict frugality, the holy band succeeded in living there, and in this there was naturally seen a miracle.[6] From that time on, Jesus always spoke of John with redoubled admiration. He declared unhesitatingly[7] that he was more than a prophet; that the

[1] A light tray or platter, such as are used in the East for serving food or drink.

[2] Matt. xiv. 3–12; Mark vi. 14–29; Josephus, *Antiq.* XVIII. v. 2.

[3] Josephus, *Antiq.* XVIII. v. 1, 2.

[4] Matt. xiv. 12. [5] Matt. xiv. 13.

[6] Matt. xiv. 15–21; Mark vi. 35–44; Luke ix. 12–17; John vi. 2–13.

[7] Matt. xi. 7–11; Luke vii. 24–28.

Law and the ancient Prophets had had force only until he came;[1] that he had superseded them; but that the kingdom of heaven would in turn supersede him. In fine, he assigned him a special place in the economy of the Christian mystery, which made him the link of union between the ancient covenant and the new kingdom.

The prophet Malachi, whose opinion in this matter was put in sharp relief,[2] had definitely announced a precursor of the Messiah, who was to prepare men for the final restoration, — a messenger, who should come to make straight the paths before God's chosen one. This messenger was none other than the prophet Elijah, who, according to a widely spread belief, was soon to descend from heaven, whither he had been borne, in order to prepare men by repentance for the great advent, and to reconcile God with his people.[3] Sometimes associated with Elijah was either the patriarch Enoch — to whom for one or two centuries lofty saintliness had been ascribed[4] — or Jeremiah,[5] who was regarded as a sort of protecting genius of the people, constantly occupied in praying for them before the throne of God.[6] This idea — of two of the old prophets rising again, to act as forerunners to the Messiah — is found in so striking a form in the doctrine of the Parsees that one is

[1] Matt. xi. 12, 13; Luke xvi. 16.

[2] Mal. iii. iv.; Eccles. xlviii. 10. (See above, chap. vi.).

[3] Matt. xi. 14; xvii. 10. Mark vi. 15; viii. 28; ix. 10–13. Luke ix. 8, 19. John i. 21. Justin, *Tryph.* 49.

[4] Eccles. xliv. 16. 4 Esdras v. 26; vii. 28, comparing xiv. 9, and the last lines of the Syriac, Ethiopic, Arabic, and Armenian versions (Volkmar, *Esdra proph.* 212; Ceriani, *Monum. sacr.* and *prof.* I. ii. 124; Armenian Bible of Zohrab, Venice, 1805, suppl. p. 25).

[5] Matt. xvi. 14.

[6] 2 Macc. xv. 13–16.

strongly led to believe that it came from Persia.[1] Be that as it may, it formed at the time of Jesus an integral portion of the Jewish theories in regard to the Messiah. It was admitted that the appearance of "two faithful witnesses," clothed in penitential garments, would be the prelude to the great drama about to be unfolded, to the astonishment of the universe.[2]

We can well understand that with these ideas Jesus and his disciples could not hesitate about the mission of John the Baptist. When the Scribes raised the objection that it could not yet be a question of the Messiah, inasmuch as Elijah had not yet come,[3] they replied that Elijah had come; that John was Elijah raised from the dead.[4] By his manner of life, by his opposition to the established political authorities, John recalled, in fact, that strange figure in the ancient history of Israel.[5] Nor was Jesus silent in regard to the merits and excellences of his forerunner. He said that among the children of men none greater had been born. He vehemently blamed the Pharisees and the doctors that they had not accepted his baptism, or been converted at his voice.[6]

The disciples of Jesus were faithful to these principles of their Master. Reverence for John was a constant tradition in the first Christian generation.[7] He was

[1] Anquetil-Duperron, citations from *Zendavesta* i. 2, 46; corrected by Spiegel in *Zeitschr. der deutsch. morgenländ. Gesellschaft*, i. 261 *et seq.*; extr. from *Jemasp-Nameh* in Spiegel's *Avesta*, i. 34. None of the Parsee texts implying the resurrection of prophets or forerunners is ancient; but the ideas hinted in them seem to be much older.

[2] Revel. xi. 3–6.

[3] Mark ix. 10.

[4] Matt. xi. 14; xvii. 10–13. Mark vi. 15; ix. 10–12. Luke ix. 8. John i. 21–25.

[5] Luke i. 17.

[6] Matt. xxi. 32; Luke vii. 29, 30.

[7] Acts xix. 4.

supposed to be a relative of Jesus.[1] His baptism was regarded as the earliest event in all the gospel history, and in some sort as the essential introduction to it.[2] In order to establish the mission of the son of Joseph upon testimony admitted by all, it was related that John, at the first sight of Jesus, proclaimed him the Messiah; that he confessed himself his inferior, unworthy to loose the latchets of his shoes; that he refused at first to baptise him, and urged that it was he who ought to be baptised by Jesus.[3] These were exaggerations, sufficiently refuted by the doubtful tone of John's last message.[4] But, in a more general sense, John remains in the Christian legend that which he was in reality, — the austere forerunner, the stern preacher of repentance before the joy of the arrival of the bridegroom; the prophet, who announces the kingdom of God, and dies before beholding it. This hero of primitive Christianity, this eater of locusts and wild honey, this rugged redresser of wrongs, was the bitter herb which prepared the lip for the sweetness of the kingdom of God. The victim of Herodias inaugurated the era of Christian martyrs: he was the first witness of the new religious thought. The worldly, who found their real enemy in him, could not permit him to live; his mutilated corpse, stretched across the threshold of Christianity, indicated the bloody path in which so many others were to follow.

The school of John did not die with its founder. It

[1] Luke i.

[2] Acts i. 22; x. 37, 38. This is fully explained if we admit, with the Fourth Gospel (chap. i.), that Jesus enlisted his first and most important disciples from the following of John.

[3] Matt. iii. 14, 15; Luke iii. 16; John i. 15–18, and v. 32, 33.

[4] Matt. xi. 2, 3; Luke vii. 18-20.

existed for some time distinct from that of Jesus, and at first on good terms with it. Years after the death of the two masters, people were still baptised with the baptism of John. Certain persons were members of the two schools at the same time, — for example, the celebrated Apollos, the associate of Saint Paul (about A. D. 54), and a goodly number of the Christians of Ephesus.[1] Josephus entered (A. D. 53) the school of an ascetic named Banou,[2] who offers a striking resemblance to John the Baptist, and who was perhaps of his company. This Banou[3] lived in the desert, and was clothed with the leaves of trees; his only food was wild plants and fruits, and he bathed frequently, day and night, in cold water, in order to purify himself. James, who was called the "brother of the Lord," practised a similar asceticism.[4] Later, near the end of the first century, baptism was in conflict with Christianity, especially in Asia Minor. The author of the writings attributed to John the evangelist appears to oppose it indirectly.[5] One of the Sibylline poems[6] seems to proceed from this school. As to the sects of Hemerobaptists, Baptists, and Elkesaïtes (*Sabians* and *Mogtasila* of the Arabian writers)[7] who in the second century filled Syria, Palestine, and Babylonia, — whose representatives still exist in our day under the name Mandæans (Mendaïtes), or "Christians of St. John," — they are rather of the same

[1] Acts xviii. 25; xix. 1–5. Compare Epiphan. *Adv. hær.* xxx. 16.

[2] Josephus, *Life*, 2.

[3] Possibly the Bounai reckoned by the Babylonian Talmud (*Sanhedrin*, 43 *a*) among the disciples of Jesus.

[4] Hegesippus in Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* ii. 23.

[5] John i. 8, 26, 33; iv. 2. 1 Ep. John v. 6. Acts x. 47.

[6] Lib. iv., especially verse 157 *et seq.*

[7] *Sabian*, in Aramaic, is the equivalent of "Baptist;" *Mogtasila* has the same meaning in Arabic.

origin as the movement of John the Baptist than of authentic descent from him. The true school of John, partly blended with Christianity, became a small Christian sect, and died out in obscurity. John had a clear presentiment of this result. If he had yielded to a pitiful rivalry, he would to-day be forgotten in the crowd of sectaries of his time. By rising above personal ambition, he has attained a glorious and unique position in the religious pantheon of humanity.

CHAPTER XIII.

IN JERUSALEM.

Jesus went almost every year to Jerusalem for the Feast of the Passover. The particulars of these journeys are meagre, for the Synoptics do not speak of them,[1] and the notes of time in the Fourth Gospel are on this point very confused.[2] It was, it would seem,

[1] Still, they obscurely imply these visits. They, as well as the Fourth Gospel, recognise the relations with Joseph of Arimathea. Luke (x. 38–42) knows the family of Bethany, and even hints vaguely at a plan of journeyings not unlike that mentioned by John; his itinerary, in fact (ix. 51–xviii. 31), is so strange as to seem as if constructed from incidents of several journeys. Certain fragments — x. 25–42 (the good Samaritan and the household of Bethany); xi. 29–32, 37–41; xii. 1–11; xiii. 10–17, 31–35; xiv. 1–6; xv. 1, 2 — seem to belong to Jerusalem or its neighbourhood. The difficulty in this view seems to result from Luke's bringing everything into the Synoptic framework, from which he does not venture to depart. The larger part of the attack on Pharisees and Sadducees, which the Synoptics represent as made in Galilee, have scarce a meaning unless at Jerusalem. Finally, the length of time which they allow from his entrance into Jerusalem to his death, though it may possibly extend to several weeks (Matt. xxvi. 55; Mark xiv. 49), is not enough to admit all the incidents recorded. The passages in Matt. xxiii. 37 and Luke xiii. 34 seem to confirm this view; though this, it may be urged, is a quotation, like Matt. xxiii. 34, referring in general terms to the various messages divinely sent to save the chosen people.

[2] Two pilgrimages are clearly indicated (John ii. 13 and v. 1), besides the final journey (vii. 10), after which Jesus returns no more to Galilee. The first was while John was still baptising, and would, accordingly, correspond with the Passover of A. D. 29. But the circumstances recounted belong to a later date: compare John ii. 14–17 (driving the money-changers from the Temple) with Matt. xxi. 12, 13; Mark xi. 15–17; Luke xix. 45, 46. Evidently, the date has been altered in the early chapters of the

in the year A. D. 31, and certainly after the death of John, that the most important of the visits of Jesus to Jerusalem took place. Several of the disciples followed him. Although Jesus at that time attached little value to the pilgrimage, he fell in with it in order not to offend Jewish opinion, with which he had not yet broken. These journeys, moreover, were essential to his design; for he already felt that, in order to complete his task, he must go out from Galilee and attack Judaism in its stronghold, which was Jerusalem.

The little Galilean community was here by no means at home. Jerusalem was then much what it is to-day, — a city of pedantry, acrimony, disputes, hatreds, and littleness of mind. Fanaticism was rampant there, and religious seditions broke out daily. The Pharisees were dominant: the study of the Law, pushed to the most insignificant minutiæ and reduced to questions of casuistry, was the only study. This exclusively theological and canonical culture no way contributed to refine the intellect. It was something like the barren doctrine of the Mussulman *fakir*, — that empty science debated round the mosque, at great cost of time and pure waste of logic, without aiding the right discipline of the mind. The theological education of our modern clergy, though very dry, can give us no idea of this; for the Renaissance has introduced into all our teachings, even the most rebellious, something of literary feeling and of method, so that scholasticism itself has taken its colouring, more or less, from the humanities. The science of the Jewish doctor — the *sofer*, or scribe — was purely barbarous, utterly absurd, and without a spark

Fourth Gospel; or, more likely, the incidents of different journeys have been confused.

of moral life.[1] To cap the evil, it filled one who had exhausted himself in learning it with an absurd conceit. Proud of the pretended science that had cost him so much trouble, the Jewish scribe disdained Greek culture exactly as the learned Mussulman of our time despises European civilisation, or as a Catholic theologian of the old school despises the intelligence of men of the world. The nature of this scholastic discipline is to close the mind against all that is refined; to train the eye only for those difficult trifles which have already depleted the life, regarding them as the natural occupation of persons making a profession of serious things.[2]

This hateful atmosphere could not but weigh very heavily on the tender heart and clear moral sense of the northern Israelites. The contempt felt at Jerusalem for the Galileans made the separation still more complete. In that beautiful Temple, the object of all their desires, they often met nothing but insult. A verse of the pilgrim's psalm, "I had rather be a doorkeeper in the house of my God,"[3] seemed expressly made for them. A disdainful priesthood smiled at their simple devotion, — just as in former time the Italian clergy, at home in the sanctuaries, witnessed coldly and almost jestingly the fervour of the pilgrim coming from afar. The Galileans spoke a rather corrupt dialect; their pronunciation was faulty; they confounded the different aspirates, which led to mistakes that were much laughed at.[4] In religion, they were regarded as

[1] It may be judged from the Talmud, which is an echo from the Jewish schools of this time.

[2] See Josephus, *Antiq.* XX. xi. 2.

[3] Ps. lxxxiv. 11

[4] Matt. xxvi. 73; Mark xiv. 70; Acts ii. 7; Babylonian Talmud, *Erubin*, 53 *a*, *b*; *Bereschith rabba*, 26 *c*.

ignorant and not quite orthodox;[1] the expression "foolish Galileans" had become proverbial.[2] It was believed (not without reason) that they were not of pure Jewish blood, and it was taken for granted that Galilee could not produce a prophet.[3] Placed thus on the confines of Judaism, and almost outside of it, the poor Galileans had only one ill-interpreted passage in Isaiah on which to build their hopes:[4] —

Land of Zebulon, and land of Naphtali!
Way of the sea,[5] Galilee of the nations!
The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light:
They that dwell in the land of the shadow of death,
Upon them hath the light shined.

The reputation of the native city of Jesus seems to have been particularly bad. It was a popular proverb, "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?"[6]

The extreme barrenness of Nature in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem must have added to the dislike of Jesus for the place. The valleys are without water; the soil is arid and stony. Casting the eye into the valley of the Dead Sea, the view is somewhat striking; elsewhere it is monotonous. The hill of Mizpeh, with its memories of the oldest history of Israel, alone relieves the eye. The aspect of the city at the time of Jesus was about the same as now. It had very few ancient

[1] See the passage just cited from the tract *Erubin;* Mishna, *Nedarim*, ii. 4; Jerusalem Talmud, *Schabbath* xvi. (end); Babylonian Talmud, *Baba bathra*, 25 *b*.

[2] *Erubin* (l. c.) 53 *b*.

[3] John vii. 52. It has been shown by modern criticism that two or three prophets were born in Galilee; but the facts that prove it were unknown at the time of which we speak. (See, for Elijah, Josephus, *Antiq* VIII. xiii. 2.

[4] Isaiah ix. 1, 2; Matt. iv. 13–16.

[5] See p. 195, note 4.

[6] John i. 46 (weak authority).

monuments; for, until the time of the Asmoneans, the Jews had remained strangers to all the arts. John Hyrcanus had begun to embellish it, and Herod the Great had made it a splendid city. The Herodian constructions, in their grand style, their perfect execution, and the beauty of their material,[1] vie with the most finished works of antiquity. A great number of tombs, of original taste, were erected about this time in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem.[2] The style of these monuments was Grecian, adapted to the customs of the Jews, and considerably modified to accord with their rules. The sculptured forms of animals, which the Herods had sanctioned to the great disgust of the purists, were discarded and replaced by leafwork and flowers. The taste of the ancient inhabitants of Phœnicia and Palestine for massive stone structures cut out of solid rock seemed to be revived in those singular tombs hollowed in the cliff, in which Grecian orders are so strangely applied to an architecture of cave-dwellers. Jesus, who regarded works of art as a pompous display of vanity, viewed these monuments with displeasure.[3] His absolute spiritualism, and his settled conviction that the structures of the old world were about to pass away, left him a taste only for things appealing to the heart.

The Temple, at the time of Jesus, was quite new, and its outworks were not yet completed. Herod had begun rebuilding it in the year 20 or 21 before the Christian era, in order to make it uniform with his

[1] Josephus, *Antiq.* XV. viii.-xi.; *Wars*, V. v. 6. Mark xiii. 1, 2.

[2] Tombs of the Judges and Kings, — Absalom, Zechariah, Jehoshaphat, St. James (so called). Compare the description of the tomb of the Maccabees at Modin: 1 Macc. xiii. 27 [and *Hist. of Israel*, v. 112].

[3] Matt. xxiii. 29; xxiv. 1, 2. Mark xiii. 1, 2; Luke xxi. 5, 6. Compare Enoch xcvii. 13, 14; Babylonian Talmud, *Schabbath*, 23 *b*.

other edifices. The main body of the Temple was finished in eighteen months, and the porches in eight years;[1] but the accessory portions went on slowly, and were completed not long before the taking of Jerusalem.[2] Jesus probably saw the work in hand, not without a degree of secret vexation. These hopes of a long future seemed an insult to his approaching advent. Clearer-sighted than the unbelievers and the fanatics, he foresaw that these superb edifices were destined to a short duration.[3]

The Temple, nevertheless, formed a marvellously imposing whole, of which the present *haram*,[4] with all its beauty, can scarcely give us any idea. The courts and surrounding colonnades served as daily gathering-places for a considerable crowd, so much so that this great space was at once temple, forum, tribunal, and university. All the religious discussions of the Jewish schools, all instruction in the ritual, even lawsuits and civil processes, — in short, all the activity of the nation was centred there.[5] Here was a perpetual clashing of arguments, an arena of disputes, resounding with sophisms and subtle questions. Thus the Temple was much like a Mahometan mosque. At this period the Romans treated all foreign religions with scrupulous respect,

[1] Josephus, *Antiq.* XV. xi. 5, 6.

[2] *Ibid.* XX. ix. 7; John ii. 20.

[3] Matt. xxiv. 2; xxvi. 61; xxvii. 40. Mark xiii. 2; xiv. 58; xv. 29. Luke xxi. 6; John ii. 19, 20.

[4] See Vogüé's *Temple de Jerusalem* (Paris, 1864). The Temple, with its courts, no doubt occupied the site of the mosque of Omar and the *haram*, or sacred enclosure around the mosque. The embankment of the *haram* is, in parts, well known as the place where the Jews gather to weep, at the very substructure of Herod's temple. [Hist. of Israel, v. 246–249.]

[5] Luke ii. 46–49; Mishna, *Sanhedrin*, x. 2; Babylonian Talmud, *Sanhedrin*, 41 *a*; *Rosch hasschana*, 31 *a*.

provided they kept within proper limits,[1] and strictly refrained from entering the sanctuary: Greek and Latin inscriptions marked the point up to which those who were not Jews were permitted to advance.[2] But the tower of Antonia, the headquarters of the Roman force, commanded the whole enclosure, and gave a view of all that went on there.[3] The police of the Temple belonged to the Jews; this was superintended by a captain, who caused the gates to be opened and shut, prevented any one from crossing the enclosure with a stick in his hand, or with dusty shoes, or when carrying parcels, or to shorten his way.[4] They were especially scrupulous in watching that no one entered the inner porches in a state of legal impurity. Women had reserved spaces, surrounded with wooden partitions, in the middle of the outer court.

While at Jerusalem, Jesus passed his days about the Temple. The period of the feasts brought vast crowds to the city. Lodged in parties of ten to twenty persons in one chamber, the pilgrims invaded every quarter, and lived in that careless, huddled state in which Orientals delight.[5] Jesus was lost in the crowd, and his poor Galileans grouped around him were of small account. He probably felt that he was here in a hostile world which would receive him only with disdain. Everything he saw, he disapproved of. The

[1] Suetonius, *Aug.* 93.

[2] Philo, *Leg. ad Caium*, 31. Josephus, *Wars*, V. v. 2; VI. ii. 4. Acts xxi. 28.

[3] Traces of the tower of Antonia are still to be seen on the north side of the *haram*.

[4] Mishna, *Berakoth*, ix. 5; Babyl. Talmud, *Jebamoth*, 6 *b*; Mark xi. 16.

[5] Josephus, *Wars*, II. xiv. 3; VI. ix. 3: compare Psalm cxxxiii. ("Behold how good and pleasant it is").

Temple, like all much-frequented places of devotion, presented no very edifying spectacle. The ritual service entailed a multitude of very repulsive details, especially business transactions, in consequence of which actual shops were established within the sacred enclosure. Here were sold beasts for the sacrifices; here were counters for the exchange of money; at times you might think yourself in a market-place.[1] The inferior officers of the Temple fulfilled their functions, doubtless, with the vulgar undevoutness common to sacristans of all ages. This profane and indifferent air in the handling of holy things wounded the religious feeling of Jesus, which was sometimes carried to a scruple.[2] He would say they had made the house of prayer a den of thieves. One day, in fact, it is said that, carried away by his anger, he lashed these vulgar salesmen with a "scourge of small cords," and overturned their tables.[3] In general, he had no liking for the Temple. Worship of his Father, such as he conceived it, had nothing to do with scenes of butchery. All these old Jewish institutions offended him, and he was pained in being obliged to conform to them. Thus, neither the Temple nor its site inspired pious emotion in the heart of Christianity, except among the Judaising Christians. Men of the new faith had an aversion to this ancient sanctuary. Constantine and the first Christian emperors left the Pagan structures of Hadrian standing there.[4] It was the enemies of Christianity, such as

[1] Babylonian Talmud, *Rosch hasschana*, 31 *a*; *Sanhedrin*, 41 *a*; *Schabbath*, 15 *a*.

[2] Mark xi. 16.

[3] Matt. xxi. 12, 13; Mark xi. 15, 16; Luke xix. 45, 46; John ii. 14–17.

[4] Jerome on Isaiah ii. 8 and Matt. xxiv. 15; *Itin. a Burdig. Hierus* p. 152 (ed. Schott).

Julian, who gave thought to this spot.[1] When Omar entered Jerusalem, the site of the Temple was designedly polluted in hatred of the Jews.[2] It was Islam — that is to say, a sort of resurrection of Judaism in its most Semitic form — that restored its honours. The place has always been antichristian.

The disdainful temper of the Jews completed the discontent of Jesus, and embittered his sojourn in Jerusalem. In proportion as the great ideas of Israel ripened, the priestly office was debased. The institution of synagogues had given to the doctor — the interpreter of the law — a great superiority over the priest. There were no priests except at Jerusalem; and even here, reduced to entirely ritual functions, — like what our parish priests would be if debarred from preaching, — they were kept down by the orator of the synagogue, the casuist, the *sofer*, or scribe, though this last was but a layman. The celebrated men of the Talmud are not priests; they are men of what their time esteemed as learning. The high-priesthood of Jerusalem held, it is true, a very exalted rank in the nation; but it was by no means at the head of the religious movement. The sovereign pontiff, whose dignity had already been degraded by Herod,[3] became more and more a Roman functionary,[4] frequently set aside that others might share the profits of the office. Opposed to the Pharisees, who were very eager lay-zealots, the priests were almost all Sadducees, — that is to say, members of that sceptical aristocracy which gathered about the Temple,

[1] Ammianus Marcellinus, xxiii. 1.
[2] Eutychius, *Ann.* ii. 286 *et seq.* (Oxford, 1659).
[3] Josephus, *Antiq.* XV. iii. 1, 3.
[4] *Ibid.* XVIII. ii.

living by the altar, but seeing the vanity of it.[1] The sacerdotal caste was so widely apart from the national sentiment and the great religious movement which urged the people on, that the name "Sadducee" (*sadoki*) — at first denoting simply a member of the sacerdotal family of Zadok — had become synonymous with "materialist" and "epicurean."

An element still worse had come, since the reign of Herod the Great, to corrupt the high-priesthood. Herod having become enamoured of Mariamne[2] (daughter of a certain Simon, son of Boëthus of Alexandria), and having set his heart on marrying her (about B. C. 28), saw no other means of ennobling his father-in-law and raising him to his own rank than by making him high-priest. This intriguing family remained masters of the sovereign pontificate, almost without interruption, for thirty-five years.[3] Closely allied to the reigning family, it did not lose the office until after the deposition of Archelaus, and recovered it (A. D. 42) after Herod Agrippa had for some time renewed the work of Herod the Great. Under the name "Boëthusim"[4] a new sacerdotal nobility was formed, which was very worldly, totally undevout, and almost merged with the Sadokim. The Boëthusim, in the Talmud and the rabbinical writings, are depicted as a kind of

[1] Acts iv. 1–21; v. 17; xix. 14. Josephus, *Antiq.* XX. ix. 1. *Pirké Aboth*, 1, 10. Comp. Tosiphta, *Menachoth*, ii.

[2] Mother of Philip (the husband of Herodias and father of Salome), and not to be confounded with the Asmonean princess, granddaughter of Hyrcanus. — TR.

[3] Josephus, *Antiq.* XV. ix. 3; XVII. vi. 4, and xiii. 1; XVIII. i. 1, and ii. 1; XIX. vi. 2, and viii. 1.

[4] This name is found only in Jewish documents. In my opinion, the "Herodians" of the New Testament are the Boëthusim. The account of the Herodians given by Epiphanius (xx.) is of little weight.

unbelievers, and are always confounded with the Sadducees.[1] From all this there resulted a kind of Roman court about the Temple, living by politics, little inclined to excess of zeal, even dreading it rather, not wishing to hear of holy personages or of innovators, for this party found its profit in the established routine. These epicurean priests had not the violence of the Pharisees; they only wished for quiet: it was their moral indifference, their cold irreligion, that revolted Jesus. Although quite distinct, the priests and the Pharisees were thus confounded in his antipathies. But, being a stranger without influence, he was long compelled to keep his dissatisfaction to himself, and to confide his feelings only to the intimate friends who accompanied him.

Before his last stay, much the longest he ever made at Jerusalem, and ending in his death, Jesus endeavoured, notwithstanding, to make himself heard. He preached; he was talked about; and certain acts of his were discussed which were looked upon as miraculous. But from all this there resulted neither an established church nor a group of disciples at Jerusalem. The winning teacher, who pardoned every one provided

[1] See the treatise *Aboth Nathan*, 5; *Soferim*, iii. ḥal. 5; Mishna, *Menachoth*, x. 3; Babylonian Talmud, *Schabbath*, 118 *a*. The name *Boëthusim* is often used interchangeably in the Talmud with *Sadducees* or the word *minim* (heretics): compare Tosiphta, *Joma*, i. with the same treatise in Jerusalem Talmud, i. 5, and Babylonian Talmud, 19 *b*; Tos. *Sukka*, iii. with the same in Babylonian Talmud, 43 *b*, and, further on, with 48 *b*; Tos. *Rosch hasschana*, i. with the same in Mishna, ii. 1, Jerusalem Talmud, ii. 1, and Babylonian Talmud, 122 *b*; Tos. *Menachoth*, x. with Mish. x. 3, and Babylonian Talmud, 65 *a*; Mishna, *Chagiga*, ii. 4, and Megillath Taanith, i.; Tos. *Iadaim*, ii. with Jerusalem Talmud, *Baba bathra*, viii. 1, and Babylonian Talmud, ibid. 115 *b*, Meg. Taan. v. Compare also Mark viii. with Matt. xvi. 6.

they but loved him, found little response in this sanctuary of vain disputes and obsolete sacrifices. The sole result for him was a few friendly personal relations, whose fruit he gathered later. He does not appear at that time to have made the acquaintance of the family of Bethany, which amid the trials of his last days brought him so much solace. But perhaps he had relations with that Mary, mother of Mark, whose house became some years later the meeting-place of the apostles, and with Mark himself.[1] Very early, too, he attracted the attention of a certain Nicodemus, a rich Pharisee, a member of the Sanhedrim, and a man highly considered in Jerusalem.[2] This man, who appears to have been upright and sincere, felt himself drawn towards the young Galilean. Not wishing to compromise himself, he came to see Jesus by night, and had a long conversation with him.[3] He undoubtedly preserved a favourable impression of Jesus; for later on he defended him against the prejudices of the ruling Jews,[4] and at the death of Jesus we find him tending with pious care the body of the Master.[5] Nicodemus did not become a Christian; he considered it due to his position not to take part in a revolutionary movement, which as yet

[1] Mark xiv. 51, 52, where the "young man" appears to be Mark; see also Acts xii. 12.

[2] He seems to be referred to in the Babylonian Talmud, *Taanith*, 20 *a*; *Gittin*, 56 *a*; *Ketuboth*, 66 *b*; treatise *Aboth Nathan*, vii.; Midrasch rabba, *Eka*, 64 *a*. The passage in *Taanith* identifies him with Bounai, who, according to *Sanhedrin* (see above p. 219 *n.* 3), was a disciple of Jesus. But if Bounai is the Banou of Josephus, this has no weight.

[3] John iii. 1–12. The language of the conversation is the composition of the evangelist; but it will hardly be maintained that Nicodemus himself, with the part he plays in the life of Jesus, is an invention of his.

[4] John vii. 50–52.

[5] John xix. 39.

numbered no men of note among its adherents. But he exhibited much good-will for Jesus, and rendered him service, though powerless to rescue him from a death which even at this period was all but decreed.

As to the celebrated doctors of the time, Jesus appears not to have had anything to do with them. Hillel and Shammai were dead; the greatest authority of the day was Gamaliel, grandson of Hillel. He was of a liberal mind, a man of the world, inclined to secular studies, and rendered tolerant by his intercourse with good society.[1] Differing from the very strict Pharisees, who walked veiled or with closed eyes, he looked at women, even those of Gentiles.[2] Tradition excuses this, as well as his acquaintance with Greek, because he had access to the court.[3] After the death of Jesus he expressed (it is said) very moderate views in regard to the new sect.[4] Saint Paul came out from his school,[5] but it is most probable that Jesus never went into it.

One idea, at least, Jesus carried away from Jerusalem, which henceforth appears rooted in his mind, — that he must not think of making any terms with the ancient Jewish worship. The abolition of the sacrifices that had caused him so much disgust, the suppression of an impious and haughty priesthood, and in a general sense the abrogation of the Law, appeared to him an absolute necessity. From this moment he is no longer a Jewish reformer; he shows himself a destroyer of Judaism itself. Some advocates of messianic ideas had already admitted that the Messiah would bring a new

[1] Mishna, *Baba metsia*, v. 8; Babylonian Talmud, *Sota*, 49 *b*.
[2] Jerusalem Talmud, *Berakoth*, ix. 2.
[3] Passage of *Sota* before cited, and *Baba kama*, 83 *a*.
[4] Acts v. 34–39.
[5] Acts xxii. 3.

law, which should be common to all people.[1] The Essenes, who were scarcely Jews, appear also to have been indifferent to the Temple and to the Mosaic observances. But these were only isolated or unavowed instances of boldness. Jesus first dared to say that from his time, or rather from that of John,[2] the Law no longer existed. If sometimes he used more guarded terms,[3] it was in order not to shock too violently existing prejudices. When he was driven to extremities he put off all reserve, and declared that the Law had no longer any force. On this subject he used striking comparisons: "No man stitches a piece of new cloth upon an old garment, neither do men put new wine into old skins."[4] This step makes him, in practice, the master and originator. The Temple, by scornful placards, excluded all except Jews from its enclosure. Jesus would have none of this. That narrow, hard, and uncharitable Law was made only for the children of Abraham. Jesus maintains that every man of right will, every man who receives and loves him, is a son of Abraham.[5] The pride of blood appears to him the chief enemy he has to combat. In other words, Jesus is no longer a Jew. He is in the highest degree revolutionary: he calls all men to a worship founded solely on the fact of their being children of God. He pro-

[1] Sibylline Books, iii. 573 *et seq.*, 715 *et seq.*, 756–758. Compare Targum of Jonathan, Isaiah xii. 3.

[2] Luke xvi. 16. The corresponding passage of Matthew, xi. 12, 13, is not so clear, but its meaning is the same.

[3] Matt. v. 17, 18 (compare Babylonian Talmud, *Schabbath*, 116 *b*). This passage does not conflict with those which imply the abolition of the Law; it merely signifies that all the figures of the Old Testament are fulfilled in Jesus (comp. Luke xvi. 17).

[4] Matt. ix. 16, 17; Luke v. 36–39.

[5] Luke xix. 9.

claims the rights of man, not the rights of the Jew; the religion of man, not the religion of the Jew; the deliverance of man, not the deliverance of the Jew.[1] How far removed was this from a Gaulonite Judas or a Matthias Margaloth, preaching revolution in the name of the Law! The religion of humanity is thus established, not upon blood, but upon the heart. Moses is superseded; the Temple is rendered useless, and is irrevocably condemned.

[1] Matt. xxiv. 14; xxviii. 19. Mark xiii. 10; xvi. 15. Luke xxiv. 47.

CHAPTER XIV.

SAMARITANS AND PAGANS.

With these views, Jesus disdained all religion which was not of the heart. The vain practices of devotees,[1] the outward strictness which trusts to posturing for salvation, had in him a mortal enemy. He cared little for fasting.[2] Pardon of an injury he preferred to sacrifice.[3] The love of God, charity, and mutual forgiveness were his whole law.[4] Nothing could savour less of sacerdotalism. The priest, as such, ever urges public sacrifice, of which he is the appointed minister; he discourages private prayer, which is a means of dispensing with his office. We should seek in vain in the Gospel for one religious rite recommended by Jesus. Baptism to him was only of secondary importance;[5] and as to prayer, he prescribes nothing, except that it must come from the heart. As is always the case, many thought to substitute the good-will of feeble souls for genuine love of goodness, and imagined they could gain the kingdom of heaven by saying to him, "Rabbi, Rabbi;" but he repelled them, and proclaimed that his religion consists in doing good,[6] quoting to

[1] Matt. xv. 9.

[2] Matt. ix. 14; xi. 19.

[3] Matt. v. 23–26; ix. 13; xii. 7.

[4] Matt. xxii. 37–40; Mark xii. 29, 30; Luke x. 25–37.

[5] Matt. xxviii. 19 and Mark xvi. 16 do not represent his real words: compare Acts x. 47 and 1 Cor. i. 47.

[6] Matt. vii. 21; Luke vi. 46.

them the passage in Isaiah, "This people honour me with their lips, but their heart is far from me."[1]

The Sabbath was the chief point upon which the whole edifice of Pharisaic scruples and subtilties was built up. This ancient and admirable institution had become a pretext for the miserable disputes of casuists, and a source of a thousand superstitious beliefs.[2] It was believed that Nature observed it; all intermittent springs were accounted "Sabbatical."[3] This was, moreover, the point upon which Jesus most delighted in defying his adversaries.[4] He openly violated the Sabbath, and only replied by keen raillery to the charges brought against him. Still more strongly he despised a host of modern observances which tradition had added to the Law, and which for that very reason were dearest of all to the devotees. Ablutions, and the too subtile distinctions between things pure and impure, found in him a pitiless opponent. "Can you wash your soul?" he would say; "not what a man eats, but what comes out of his heart defiles him." The Pharisees, who upheld these absurdities, were the continual target of his attacks. He accused them of outbidding the Law, of inventing impracticable precepts, in order to create occasions of sin in man. "Blind leaders of the blind," said he, "take care lest ye also fall into the ditch." "O generation of vipers!" he

[1] Matt. xv. 8; Mark vii. 6: compare Isaiah xxix. 13.

[2] See, especially, the treatise *Schabbath* of the Mishna, and the Book of Jubilees (translated from the Ethiopic in Ewald's *Jahrbücher*, Years 2, 3), chap. l.

[3] Josephus, *Wars*, VII. v. 1; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xxxi. 18: compare "The Land and the Book" (Thomson), i. 406.

[4] Matt. xii. 1–14. Mark ii. 23–28. Luke vi. 1–5; xiii. 14–17; xiv. 1–6.

would add in private; "they talk only of goodness, while they are foul within, — and so belie the proverb, that out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." [1]

Jesus did not know the Gentiles well enough to think of founding anything solid upon their conversion. Galilee contained a great number of Pagans, but, as it appears, no public and organised worship of false gods.[2] He could see this worship displayed in all its splendour in the country of Tyre and Sidon, at Cæsarea-Philippi, and in the Decapolis,[3] but he paid it little attention. We never find in him the wearisome Jewish pedantry of his time, nor those declamations against idolatry so familiar to his co-religionists from the time of Alexander, which fill, for instance, the Book of Wisdom.[4] What strikes him in the Pagans is not their idolatry, but their servility.[5] The young Jewish democrat — a brother here of Judas the Gaulonite, admitting no master but God — was offended at the honours with which they surrounded the person of the sovereign, and the lying titles given him. With this exception, when he comes in contact with Pagans he usually shows them great indulgence; sometimes he

[1] Matt. xii. 34; xv. 1–9, 12–14; xxiii. Mark vii. 1, 8, 15, 16. Luke vi. 45; xi. 39–44.

[2] The Pagans of Galilee were mostly, I think, on the boundaries, — Kadesh, for example, — while the heart of the country, except the city of Tiberias, was wholly Jewish. The line where ruins of temples end and those of synagogues begin is plainly marked at Lake Hulek (Samachonitis, or Merom). Traces of Pagan sculpture, thought to be found at Tell-Hum, are doubtful. The sea-coast, the town of Acra in particular, made no part of Galilee.

[3] See *ante*, pp. 184, 185.

[4] Chaps. xiii. xiv.

[5] Matt. xx. 25; Mark x. 42; Luke xxii. 25.

professes to conceive more hope of them than of the Jews.[1] The kingdom of God is to be transferred to them. "When the owner is displeased with those who have hired his vineyard, what does he do? He turns them out, and rents it to others who will bring him the fruits in their season."[2] Jesus adhered so much the more to this idea, as the conversion of the Gentiles was, according to Jewish notions, one of the surest signs of the advent of the Messiah.[3] In his kingdom of God he represents as seated at a feast, with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, men from the four winds of heaven, while the lawful heirs of the kingdom are rejected.[4] Often, it is true, quite an opposite drift appears in the commands he gives to his disciples: he seems to recommend them to preach salvation to the orthodox Jews alone,[5] and speaks of Pagans in a manner suited to Jewish prejudice.[6] But we must remember that the disciples, whose narrow minds did not readily adopt this lofty indifference to the rank of sons of Abraham, may have made the instructions of their master bend to their own ideas.[7] Besides, it is very possible that Jesus may have varied on this point, — just as in the Koran Mahomet speaks of Jews sometimes in the most honourable manner, sometimes with

[1] Matt. viii. 5–10; xv. 22–28. Mark vii. 25–30. Luke iv. 25–27.

[2] Matt. xxi. 41; Mark xii. 9; Luke xx. 16.

[3] Isaiah ii. 2, 3, and lx.; Amos ix. 11, 12; Jer. iii. 17; Mal. i. 11; Tobit xiii. 13, 16; Orac. Sibyll. iii. 715 *et seq.* Comp. Matt. xxiv. 14; Acts xv. 15–17.

[4] Matt. viii. 11, 12; xxi. 33–43; xxii. 1–14.

[5] Matt. vii. 6; x. 5, 6; xv. 24; xxi. 43.

[6] Matt. v. 46–48; vi. 7, 32; xviii. 17. Luke vi. 32–36; xii. 30.

[7] What leads us to think so is that the really authentic words of Jesus, the *Logia* of Matthew, are of universal moral application, and have no savour of the Jewish devotee.

extreme harshness, according as he hopes or not to draw them to him. Tradition, in fact, ascribes to Jesus two entirely opposite rules of proselytism, which he may have practised in turn: "He that is not against us is on our part;" "He that is not with me is against me.[1]" A sharp struggle almost necessarily leads to contradictions like these.

It is certain that he numbered among his disciples many men whom the Jews designated "Greeks"[2] (*Hellenes*). This term had in Palestine various meanings. Sometimes it designated the Pagans; sometimes the Jews who lived among the Pagans and spoke Greek;[3] sometimes men of Pagan origin converted to Judaism.[4] It was probably in this last category of Hellenes that Jesus found sympathy.[5] Affiliation with Judaism was of many degrees; but the proselytes always remained in a state of inferiority as compared with the Jew by birth. The former were called "proselytes of the gate," or "God-fearing men," and were subject to the commandments of Noah, but not to the Law of Moses.[6] This very inferiority was unquestionably the cause which drew them to Jesus, and won them his good-will. He dealt in the same manner with the Samaritans. Locked in like a small

[1] Matt. xii. 3; Mark ix. 39; Luke ix. 50; xi. 23.

[2] Josephus says this definitely (*Antiq.* XVIII. iii. 3), where there is no reason to suspect a change in the text. Compare John vii. 35; xii. 20, 21.

[3] Jerusalem Talmud, *Sota*, vii. 1.

[4] See John vii. 35; xii. 20. Acts xiv. 1; xvii. 4; xviii. 4; xxi. 28.

[5] John xii. 20; Acts viii. 27.

[6] Mishna, *Baba metsia*, ix. 12. Babylonian Talmud, *Sanhedrin*, 56 *b*. Acts viii. 27; x. 2, 22, 35; xiii. 16, 26, 43, 50; xvi. 14; xvii. 4, 17; xviii. 7. Gal. ii. 3. Josephus, *Antiq.* XIV. vii. 2. Lévy, *Epigr. Beiträge zur Gesch. der Juden*, 311 *et seq.*

island between the two great provinces of Judaism (Judæa and Galilee), Samaria formed in Palestine a kind of reserve, where the ancient worship of Gerizim, akin to and rivalling that of Jerusalem, was still kept up. This poor sect, having neither the genius nor the skilful organisation of Judaism proper, was treated with extreme harshness by the temple-worshippers,[1] who put it on the same level with Pagans, and hated it worse.[2] Jesus, by a sort of contrariety, was well-disposed toward it. He often prefers the Samaritans to the orthodox Jews. If in other cases he seems to forbid his disciples going to preach among them, reserving his gospel for pure Israelites,[3] this was no doubt a rule for the occasion, to which the apostles gave too absolute a meaning. Sometimes, in fact, the Samaritans received him ill, because they supposed him to be imbued with the prejudices of his co-religionists;[4] just as in our day a European free-thinker is regarded as an enemy by the Mussulman, who always believes him to be a fanatical Christian.

Jesus knew how to rise above these misunderstandings.[5] He had, it would seem, many disciples at Shechem, and he passed there at least two days.[6] On one occasion he meets with gratitude and true piety from a Samaritan only.[7] One of his most beautiful

[1] Eccles. i 27, 28. John viii. 48. Josephus, *Antiq.* IX. xiv. 3; XI. viii. 6; XII. v. 5. Jerusalem Talmud, *Aboda Zara*, v. 4; *Pesachin*, i. 1.

[2] Matt. x. 5; Luke xvii. 18: comp. Babylonian Talmud, *Cholin*, 6 *a*.

[3] Matt. x. 5, 6. [4] Luke ix. 53. [5] Luke ix. 56.

[6] John iv. 39–43. What leaves some doubt upon this passage is that Luke and the writer of the Fourth Gospel, who are both anti-Judaists and disposed to show that Jesus was favourable to Gentiles, are the only ones who speak of relations between Jesus and the Samaritans, and in this appear to contradict Matthew x. 5.

[7] Luke xvii. 16–19.

parables is that of the man left half dead by robbers on the way to Jericho: a priest passing by sees him, but goes on his way; a Levite passes, but does not stop; a Samaritan has compassion on him, goes to him and pours oil into his wounds, and binds them up;[1] from which Jesus argues that true brotherhood is established among men by charity, and not by religious creed. The "neighbour," who in Judaism was first of all the co-religionist,[2] is for him the man who has pity on his fellow without distinction of sect. Human brotherhood in its widest sense overflows in all his teaching.

These thoughts, which beset Jesus on his leaving Jerusalem, found vivid expression in an anecdote which has been preserved in regard to his return.[3] The route from Jerusalem into Galilee, at half an hour's distance from Shechem,[4] passes the opening of the valley commanded by Mounts Ebal and Gerizim. This route was in general shunned by Jewish pilgrims, who preferred going the long roundabout way through Peræa rather than expose themselves to the ill-treatment of the Samaritans, or ask any favour of them. It was forbidden to eat and drink with them;[5] it was an axiom of certain casuists that "a piece of Samaritan bread is swine's-flesh."[6] When they followed this road, provisions were always put up beforehand; yet they could rarely avoid scuffles and ill-treatment.[7]

[1] Luke x. 30–35.

[2] The passage in Levit. xix. 18, 33, 34, shows a broader feeling; but the circle of Jewish brotherhood narrowed more and more: see the dictionary, *Aruch*, under the word בן ברית.

[3] John iv. 4–42.

[4] Now *Naplouse*. That "Sychar" is Shechem follows from comparing John iv. 5 with Gen. xxxiii. 19; xlviii. 22; and Josh. xxiv. 32.

[5] Luke ix. 53; John iv. 9.

[6] Mishna, *Schebiit*, viii. 10, repeated elsewhere in the Talmud.

[7] Josephus, *Antiq.* XX. v. 1; *Wars*, II. xii. 3; *Life*, 52.

Jesus shared neither these scruples nor these fears. Arrived at the point whence the valley of Shechem opens on the left, he found himself weary, and stopped near a well. The Samaritans were then, as now, in the habit of giving to the different spots of their valley names drawn from patriarchal memories. They called this the well of Jacob: it was probably the same that is still called *Bir-Iakoub*. The disciples entered the valley, and went to the village to buy provisions; Jesus sat by the side of the well, having Gerizim in front of him. It was about noon, and a woman of Shechem came to draw water. Jesus asked of her to drink, which excited great astonishment in the woman, since the Jews generally avoided all dealings with the Samaritans. Won by the conversation of Jesus, the woman recognised in him a prophet; and, anticipating reproaches about her worship, it is she who begins the argument: "Our fathers," said she, "worshipped in this mountain, and you say that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship." "Woman," answered Jesus, "believe me, the hour is come when you will neither in this mountain nor yet at Jerusalem worship the Father; but the true worshippers will worship the Father in spirit and in truth." [1]

[1] John iv. 21–23. We need not insist on the historical accuracy of this conversation, which can have been reported only by Jesus or by the woman herself. But the narrative of this chapter certainly represents one of the inmost thoughts of Jesus, and most of the circumstances have a strong stamp of truth. The 22d verse ["Ye worship ye know not what: we know what we worship, for salvation is of the Jews"], which expresses a thought opposed to verses 21, 23, seems an awkward interpolation of the writer, alarmed at the boldness of the saying he reports. This circumstance, with the feebleness of the remainder of the passage, is no small additional reason for thinking that these verses (21, 23) are really the words of Jesus.

The day on which he uttered this saying, Jesus was in reality Son of God. He spoke for the first time the words upon which the edifice of eternal religion will repose. He founded the pure worship of all ages, of all lands, — that which all lofty souls will practise until the end of time. Not only was his religion on this day the true religion of humanity, it was the absolute religion; and if other planets have inhabitants endowed with reason and morality, their religion cannot be different from that which Jesus proclaimed near Jacob's well. Man has not been able to hold to it; for man attains the ideal but for a moment. This word of Jesus has been a flash of light amidst gross darkness; it has needed eighteen hundred years for the eyes of mankind — what do I say? for an infinitely small portion of mankind — to grow accustomed to it. But the light will shine more and more into the perfect day; and, after having traversed all the circles of error, mankind will come back to this one word as to the undying expression of its faith and hope.

CHAPTER XV.

THE MESSIAH OF PROPHECY AND LEGEND.

Jesus has now quite lost his Jewish faith, and returns to Galilee full of revolutionary zeal. His ideas are henceforth spoken with perfect clearness. The simple aphorisms of his earlier prophetic career, borrowed in part from the Jewish rabbis before his day, and the noble moral teachings of his second period, lead naturally to a more decided policy. The Law must be abolished; and he is the one appointed to abolish it.[1] The Messiah is come; and he it is who is the Messiah.[2] The kingdom of God is soon to be revealed; and it is he through whom it will be revealed. He knows well that he will fall a victim to his boldness; but the kingdom of God cannot be conquered without violence: it must be established through shocks and rendings.[3] The Son of Man after his death will return in glory, accompanied

[1] The hesitation of his immediate disciples, of whom a considerable part continued faithful to Judaism, offers serious difficulties to this explanation. But his trial leaves no room to doubt. As we shall see, he was treated by the Sanhedrim as a "deceiver" (misleader). The Talmud gives this procedure as an example of what should be followed against "misleaders" who seek to overthrow the law of Moses (Jerusalem Talmud, *Sanhedrin*, xiv. 16; Babylonian Talmud, *ibid.* 43 *a*, 67 *a*). Compare Acts vi. 13, 14.

[2] The progress of his declarations on this point may be seen by comparing Matt. xvi. 13–20; Mark i. 24, 25, 34, viii. 27–30, and xiv. 61, 62; Luke ix. 18–22.

[3] Matt. xi. 12.

by legions of angels, and those who have rejected him will be overwhelmed.

The boldness of such a conception ought not to surprise us. Jesus had long regarded his relation to God as that of a son to his father. That which in another would be unendurable pride ought not in him to be treated as a crime.

The title "Son of David" was the first that he accepted,[1] probably without being accessory to the innocent frauds by which it was sought to secure it to him. The family of David had, as it appears, been long extinct;[2] nor did the Asmoneans, who were of priestly origin, or Herod, or the Romans, dream for a moment that any representative whatsoever of the ancient dynasty existed near them. But, since the last of the Asmoneans, the dream of an unknown descendant of the ancient kings who should avenge the nation of its enemies, worked in every brain. The universal belief was that the Messiah would be a son of David,[3] and, like him, would be born at Bethlehem.[4] The first thought of Jesus was not exactly this. The remembrance of

[1] Rom. i. 3. Rev. v. 5; xxii. 16.

[2] It is true that certain doctors, such as Hillel and Gamaliel, are given out as of the race of David; but these assertions are very doubtful (see Jerusalem Talmud, *Taanith*, iv. 2). If the house of David still formed a distinct and well-known group, how is it that it never appears side by side with the sons of Zadok, the Boëthusim, the Asmoneans, the family of Herod, in the great struggles of the time? Hegesippus and Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.* iii. 19, 20) give only an echo of the Christian tradition.

[3] Matt. xxii. 42; Mark xii. 35; Luke i. 32; Acts ii. 29–36; 4 Esdras xii. 32 (in the Syriac, Arabic, Ethiopian, and Armenian versions). "Ben-David" in the Talmud often denotes the Messiah (e. g. Babylonian Talmud, *Sanhedrin*, 97 *a*).

[4] Matt. ii. 5, 6; John vii. 41, 42. This was quite arbitrarily founded upon the passage (perhaps altered) in Micah v. 2: compare the Targum of Jonathan. The primitive Hebrew text was probably *Beth-Ephrata*.

David, which with most Jews was uppermost, had nothing to do with his heavenly kingdom. He believed himself to be the Son of God, not the son of David. His kingdom and the deliverance which he meditated were of an entirely different character. But the common opinion on this point forced his hand. The proposition "Jesus is the Messiah" led directly to this other proposition, "Jesus is the son of David." He allowed a title to be given him, without which he could not hope for success; and at length, it would seem, took pleasure in it, since he performed most readily the miracles asked of him by those who appealed to him by this title.[1] In this, as in many other circumstances of his life, Jesus yielded to notions current in his time, although they might not be precisely his own. He associated with his doctrine of the "kingdom of God" all that could kindle the heart and imagination. Hence it is that we have seen him adopt the baptism of John, although it could not be of much importance to him.

One great difficulty stood in the way, — his birth at Nazareth, which was of public notoriety. We do not know whether Jesus contended against this prejudice. Perhaps it did not show itself in Galilee, where the idea that the son of David must be a Bethlehemite was less prevalent. To the Galilean idealist, too, the title "Son of David" was amply justified, if he to whom it was given should retrieve the glory of his race, and bring back the great days of Israel. Did Jesus, by his silence, give weight to the fictitious genealogies imagined by his partisans expressly to prove his royal de-

[1] Matt. ix. 27; xii. 23; xv. 22; xx. 30, 31. Mark x. 47, 52. Luke xviii. 33.

scent?[1] Did he know anything of the legends invented to show that he was born at Bethlehem,[2] and particularly of the device that connected his Bethlehemite origin with the census which took place by order of Quirinius, the imperial legate?[3] We cannot tell. The inaccuracy and contradictions of the genealogies[4] lead to the belief that they were wrought out by the popular mind, working independently at different points, and that neither of them was sanctioned by Jesus.[5] Never with his own lips does he call himself "Son of David." His disciples, much less enlightened than he, sometimes magnified what he said of himself, while he usually knew nothing of these exaggerations. We must add that during the first three centuries considerable portions of Christendom[6] obstinately denied the royal descent of Jesus and the authenticity of the genealogies.

This legend was thus the result of a wide and wholly spontaneous working of the common thought about him even in his lifetime. There has been no great his-

[1] Matt. i. 1–16; Luke iii. 23–38.

[2] It is curious, too, that there was a *Bethlehem* some three or four leagues from Nazareth: Joshua xix. 15, and Van de Velde's map. ["It was discovered by Dr. Robinson at *Beit-lahm*, six miles west of Nazareth."]

[3] Matt. ii. 1–6; Luke ii. 1–4.

[4] The two genealogies completely contradict each other, and have little in common with those of the Old Testament. The story of Luke about the census of Quirinius is in defiance of dates (see *note* on p. 91). The legend would naturally fortify itself by this circumstance. The Jews were strongly impressed by the taking of a census, which confused their narrow notions; and they long kept the memory of it (cf. Acts v. 37).

[5] Julius Africanus (in Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* i. 7) supposes that the kindred of Jesus, after taking refuge in Batanæa, made the attempt to reconstruct the genealogies.

[6] The Ebionites, Hebrews, and Nazarenes, with Tatian and Marcion: Epiphan. xxix. 9; xxx. 3, 14; xlvi. 1; Theodoret, *Hæret. fab.* i. 20; Isidore of Pelusium, *Epist.* i. 371, and Pansophium.

toric event that did not give rise to a group of fables; and Jesus could not, even had he wished, put a stop to these popular creations. Perhaps a sagacious observer might have detected even then the germ of stories which later ascribed to him a supernatural birth,[1] either in virtue of the idea (very prevalent in ancient times) that the exceptional man cannot be born of the ordinary relations of the two sexes; or else to fulfil the requirements of a misunderstood passage of Isaiah,[2] which was believed to foretell that the Messiah should be born of a virgin; or, lastly, as the result of a belief that the "breath of God," exalted to a divine *hypostasis*, is a principle of fecundity.[3] There was already current, perhaps, more than one anecdote conceived with a view to show in his biography the fulfilment of the Messianic ideal;[4] or, rather, of prophecies which the allegorical expositions of the time referred to the Messiah. A generally admitted idea was that the Messiah would be announced by a star;[5] that messengers from far countries should come at his birth to render him homage and to bring him gifts.[6] It was believed that the oracle was accomplished by alleged Chaldean astrologers who came about that time to Jerusalem.[7] Again, he was

[1] Matt. i. 18–23; Luke i. 26–35. This was certainly not a universally received opinion in the first century, since Jesus is called, without reserve, the "son of Joseph," and both the genealogies constructed to connect him with the line of David are those of Joseph (cf. Gal. iv. 4; Rom. i. 3).

[2] Isaiah vii. 14; comp. Matt. i. 22, 23.

[3] Gen. i. 2. For the similar idea among the Egyptians, see Herodotus iii. 28; Pomponius Mela, i. 9; Plutarch, *Quaest. Symp.* VIII. i. 3; De Iside et Osir. 43; Mariette, *Mém. sur la mère d'Apis* (Paris, 1856).

[4] Matt. i. 15, 23; Is. vii. 14–16.

[5] Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, Levi, 18. The name [or title] *Bar-Cochab* assumes this belief. Jerusalem Talmud, *Taanith*, iv. 8: see Numbers xxiv. 17.

[6] Isaiah lx. 3; Ps. lxxii. 10.

[7] Matt. ii. 1, 2.

associated from his birth with celebrated men, such as John the Baptist, Herod the Great, and the aged Simeon and Anna, who had left memories of great sanctity.[1] A rather loose chronology pervades these inventions, which for the most part are distortions of real facts.[2] But a singular spirit of gentleness and goodness, a deeply popular feeling, permeated all these fables, and made them a supplement to his preaching.[3] Especially after the death of Jesus, such narratives were largely expanded. We may believe, however, that they were already circulated in his lifetime, exciting no more than pious credulity and simple admiration.

That Jesus ever dreamed of claiming to be an incarnation of the true God, there is no ground whatever to suspect. Such an idea was quite foreign to the Jewish mind; the first three Gospels have no trace of it;[4] we find it hinted only in portions of the fourth, which can least of all be accepted as reflecting his own thought. Sometimes he would seem even to take precautions to repel such a doctrine.[5] The accusation that he "made himself God," or "the equal of God," is represented, even in the Fourth Gospel, as a calumny of the Jews.[6] In this Gospel he declares his Father greater than himself.[7]

[1] Luke ii. 25, 36 (slight authority).

[2] Thus the legend of the slaughter of babes at Bethlehem probably reflects some cruelty practised by Herod in that locality (see Josephus, *Antiq.* XIV. ix. 4; *Wars*, I. xxxiii. 6).

[3] Matt. i. ii.; Luke i. ii.; Justin, *Tryph.* 78, 106; Protevang. of James (apocr.), 18–20.

[4] Some passages (as Acts ii. 22) absolutely exclude it.

[5] Matt. iv. 10; vii. 21, 22; xix. 17. Mark i. 44; iii. 12; x. 17, 18 Luke xviii. 19.

[6] John v. 18–20; x. 33–36.

[7] John xiv. 28.

Elsewhere he declares that the Father has not revealed everything to him.[1] He believes himself to be more than an ordinary man, but separated from God by an infinite distance. He is Son of God; but all men are or may become so, in various degrees.[2] Every one each day ought to call God his father; all who are raised again will be sons of God.[3] The divine son-ship was attributed in the Old Testament to beings who were by no means asserted to be equal with God.[4] The word "son" has in the Semitic tongues and in the New Testament very varied figurative meanings.[5] Besides, the idea of man held by Jesus was not that low idea which a cold Deism has introduced. In his poetic conception of Nature, one breath alone pervades the universe: the breath of man is that of God; God dwells in man and lives by man, the same as man dwells in God and lives by God.[6] The transcendent idealism of Jesus never permits him to have a very clear notion of his own personality. He is his Father, — his Father is he. He lives in his disciples; he is everywhere with them;[7]

[1] Mark xiii. 35.

[2] Matt. v. 9, 45. Luke iii. 38; vi. 35; xx. 36. John i. 12, 13; x. 34, 35. Acts xvii. 28, 29. Rom. viii. 14–17, 19, 21, 23; ix. 26. 2 Cor. vi. 18. Gal. iii. 26; iv. 1–7. Phil. ii. 15. Ep. of Barnabas, 14 (p. 10, Hilgenfeld: Cod. Sinaït.). Also, Deut. xiv. 1; Wisdom ii. 13, 18.

[3] Luke xx. 36.

[4] Gen. vi. 2. Job i. 6; ii. 1; xxviii. 7. Ps. ii. 7; lxxxii. 6. 2 Sam. vii. 14.

[5] Children (sons) of the Devil (Matt. xiii. 38; Acts xiii. 10); children of this world (Mark iii. 17; Luke xvi. 8 and xx. 34); children of light (Luke xvi. 8; John xii. 36); children of the resurrection (Luke xx. 36); children of the kingdom (Matt. viii. 12; xiii. 38); children of the bridegroom (Matt. ix. 15; Mark ii. 19; Luke v. 34); children of Gehenna (Matt. xxiii. 15); sons of peace (Luke x. 6), etc. The pagan Zeus, we remember, is *πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε*.

[6] Compare Acts xvii. 28.

[7] Matt. xviii. 20; xxviii. 20.

his disciples are one, as he and his Father are one.[1] The idea to him is everything; the body, which makes the distinction of individuals, is nothing.

The title "Son of God," or simply "Son,"[2] became thus for Jesus a title analogous to "Son of Man;" and, like this, it is synonymous with "Messiah," with the sole difference that he called himself "Son of Man," and does not seem to have made the same use of the phrase "Son of God."[3] The title "Son of Man" expressed his character as judge; that of "Son of God," his participation in the designs and power of the Supreme. This power has no limits. His Father has given him "all power." He has the right even to change the Sabbath.[4] No one knows the Father but through him.[5] The Father has delegated to him the right to judge.[6] Nature obeys him; but she obeys also all who believe and pray, for faith can do everything.[7]

We must bear in mind that no idea of the laws of Nature came into his mind, or into that of his hearers, to show the limit of the impossible. The witnesses of his miracles thanked God "for having given such power unto men."[8] He pardons sins;[9] he is superior

[1] John x. 30; xvii. 21; and, in general, the last discourses reported in this Gospel, especially chap. xvii., which well expresses one phase of the mind of Jesus, — though these cannot be regarded as genuine historical documents. [Note, too, that the word for "one" is neuter (ἕν).]

[2] The passages exemplifying this are too numerous for citation.

[3] Jesus uses the expression "Son of God," or "Son," as equivalent to "I," only in the Fourth Gospel. The Synoptics use it only indirectly (Matt. xi. 27 and xxviii. 19; Mark xiii. 32; Luke x. 22). Besides, the first and last of these citations represent in the synoptic system a late interpolation conformed to the type of the Johannine discourse.

[4] Matt. xii. 8; Luke vi. 5.

[5] Matt. xi. 27; xxviii. 18. Luke x. 22.

[6] John v. 22.

[7] Matt. xvii. 18, 19; Luke xvii. 6.

[8] Matt. ix. 8.

[9] Matt. ix. 2–8; Mark ii. 5–9; Luke v. 20, and vii. 47, 48.

to Abraham, to David, to Solomon, to the Prophets.[1] We do not know in what form, or under what limitations, these claims were made. Jesus ought not to be judged by our petty conventional rules. The admiration of his disciples outran him, and carried him along. It is evident that the title *rabbi*, with which he was at first contented, no longer satisfied him; the title even of "prophet" or "messenger of God" responded no longer to his thought. The position which he assigned himself was that of a superhuman being; and he wished to be regarded as having a more exalted relation with God than other men. But it must be observed that these words "superhuman" and "supernatural," borrowed from our pitiful theology, had no meaning in the exalted religious consciousness of Jesus. To him Nature and human development were not limited realms outside of God,— paltry realities subject to laws of implacable rigour. To him there was no supernatural, for there was no Nature. Cheered by the infinite Love, he forgot the heavy chain which holds the spirit captive he cleared at one bound the deep gulf, impassable to most, which our feeble human faculty has fixed between man and God.

We cannot fail to see in these affirmations of Jesus the germ of the doctrine which was, later on, to make him a divine "hypostasis,"[2] in identifying him with the "Word," or "second God,"[3] or "eldest Son of God," or *Angel metathronos*, which Jewish theology developed from another source.[4] This theology was

[1] Matt. xii. 41, 42; xxii. 43-45. Mark xii. 6. John viii. 25, 26.

[2] See especially John xiv. and the succeeding chapters.

[3] Philo in Eusebius, *Præpar. evang.* vii. 13.

[4] See Philo, *De migr. Abraham*, § 1; *Quod Deus immut.* § 6; *De con-*

adopted from a sense of need, in order to correct the extreme rigour of the old Monotheism by placing beside the Deity an Associate, to whom the Eternal Father is supposed to delegate the government of the universe. The belief that certain men are incarnations of divine faculties or "powers" was beginning to spread: there was among the Samaritans about the same time a miracle-worker, whom they identified with the "great power of God."[1] For nearly two centuries the speculative minds of Judaism had yielded to the tendency of personifying either the divine attributes, or certain expressions referred to the Divinity. Thus, the "breath of God," often spoken of in the Old Testament, is considered as a separate being, the "Holy Spirit." In like manner, the "Wisdom of God" and the "Word of God" become self-existent persons. This was the germ of the process that engendered the *Sephiroth* of the Cabbala, the *Æons* of Gnosticism, the *hypostases* of Christian dogma, and all that arid mythology, consist-

fus. ling. §§ 14, 28; *De profugis*, § 20; *De somniis*, i. § 37; *De agric. Noë*, § 12; *Quis rerum divin. hæres*, §§ 25, 26, 48, *et seq.* "Metathronos" (μετάθρονος: that is, sharing the throne of God) is a sort of divine secretary, or accountant, holding the record of merits and faults: *Bereschith rabba*, v. 6 *c;* Babylonian Talmud, *Sanhedrin*, 38 *b; Chagiga*, 15 *a:* Targum of Jonathan, Gen. v. 24. This theory of the *Logos* contains no Greek elements. The analogies that have been supposed in it with the *Honover* of the Parsees are also without foundation. The *Minokhired*, or "Divine Intelligence," is much like the Jewish *Logos:* see fragments of the book called *Minokhired* in Spiegel, *Parsi-Grammatik*, pp. 161, 162. But the development of the doctrine of the *Minokhired* among the Parsees is modern, and may imply a foreign influence. The "divine intelligence" (*Mainyu-Khratû*) appears in the Zendic books, but without serving as the basis of a theory; it only enters into certain invocations. The analogies which have been sought between the Jewish or Christian theory of the Word (Λόγος) and certain points of Egyptian theology may be not wholly valueless; but there is no evidence that this theory was borrowed from Egypt.

[1] Acts viii. 10.

ing of personified abstractions, to which monotheism is obliged to resort when it seeks to pluralise the Deity.

Jesus appears to have remained a stranger to these hair-splittings of theology, which were soon to fill the world with barren disputes. The metaphysical theory of the "Word," such as we find it in the writings of his contemporary Philo, in the Chaldæan Targums, and even in the book of "Wisdom," [1] — of this we have no hint in the *Logia* of Matthew, nor in general in the Synoptics, the most authentic interpreters of his words. The doctrine of the "Word," in fact, had nothing in common with messianism. The "Word" of Philo and of the Targums is in no sense the Messiah. It was later on that Jesus came to be identified with the "Word," and that, starting from this principle, an entire new theology was created, very different from that of the "kingdom of God." [2] The essential function of the "Word" is that of Creator and of Providence. Now, Jesus never pretended to have created the world, or to govern it. His office will be to judge it, to restore it. The office of presiding Judge at the final tribunal of mankind is the post which Jesus claims for himself, the office which all the first Christians assigned to him.[3] Until the great day he sits at the right hand of God, as his associate, his first minister, and the agent of his future vengeance.[4] The super-

[1] Wisdom ix. 1, 2; xvi. 12: compare with vii. 12; viii. 5, 6; ix.–xi. These impersonations of Wisdom are found also in much older books, — Proverbs viii. and ix.; Job xxviii.

[2] Revel. xix. 13; John i. 1–14. It will be further noted that even in the Fourth Gospel the expression "Word" nowhere occurs excepting in the proëm, and is never put by the writer in the mouth of Jesus.

[3] Acts x. 42; Rom. ii. 16; 2 Cor. v. 10.

[4] Matt. xxvi. 64; Mark xvi. 19; Luke xxii. 69; Acts vii. 55; Rom.

human Christ of the Byzantine altar-pieces, seated as Judge of the world, in the midst of the apostles, — in the same rank with him and superior to the angels, who only stand near and serve, — is the accurate image of that conception of the "Son of Man" whose first features we find so boldly sketched in the Book of Daniel.

In any case, the rigour of a systematic theory had no place in such a world. That whole crowd of notions, just described, formed in the mind of the disciples a theological system so little settled that the Son of God, this duplication (as it were) of the Divinity, is made to act purely as a man. He is tempted; he is ignorant of many things; he corrects himself; he changes his opinion;[1] he is cast down, discouraged; he entreats his Father to spare him trials; he is submissive to God as a son.[2] He who must judge the world does not know the date of the day of judgment.[3] He takes precautions for his safety.[4] Directly after his birth he has to be concealed, to escape from powerful men who wish to kill him.[5] In his exorcism, the evil spirit resists, and will not come away at the first command.[6] In his miracles there appears a painful effort, a weariness as if "some virtue had gone out of him.[7]" All this is simply the work of a messenger of God, — a man protected and favoured by God.[8] We must not ask here

viii. 34; Eph. i. 20; Col. iii. 1; Heb. i. 3, 13; viii. 1, x. 12, and xii. 2; 1 Pet. iii. 22; with the passages before cited on the office of the Jewish *Metathronos*.

[1] Matt. x. 5, compared with xxviii. 19; Mark vii. 24, 27, 29.

[2] Matt. xxvi. 39; Mark xiv. 32–38; Luke xxii. 41–44; John xii. 27.

[3] Mark xiii. 32: cf. Matt. xxiv. 36.

[4] Matt. xii. 14–16; xiv. 13; Mark iii. 6, 7; ix. 29, 30; John vii. 1–10

[5] Matt. ii. 20.

[6] Matt. xvii. 20; Mark ix. 25.

[7] Luke viii. 45, 46; John xi. 33, 38.

[8] Acts ii. 22.

for logic or consistency. The need Jesus had of obtaining credence stands out in open contradiction to the enthusiasm of his disciples. To messianists who believed in the second coming, and to the fanatic students of the books of Daniel and Enoch, he was the Son of Man; to the Jews holding the common faith, and to the readers of Isaiah and Micah, he was the Son of David; to the disciples he was the Son of God, or simply the Son. Others, without being blamed by the disciples, took him for John the Baptist risen from the dead, for Elijah, for Jeremiah, in keeping with the popular belief that the ancient prophets were about to reappear, in order to prepare the way of the Messiah.[1]

The absolute conviction of Jesus himself, or rather an enthusiasm that made him incapable of doubt, veiled these daring claims. We, with our cold and timorous habit, little understand how any one can be so possessed by the idea of which he makes himself the spokesman. To us, the deeply earnest races, conviction signifies to be sincere with one's self. But sincerity to one's self has not much meaning to Oriental peoples, little accustomed to the subtilties of the critical spirit. Good faith and imposture are words which, in our rigid conscience, are opposed as two irreconcilable terms; in the East they are connected by a thousand shifts and windings. The authors of the Apocryphal books, — "Daniel" and "Enoch" for example, — men highly exalted, committed without a shadow of scruple, for the sake of their cause, an act which we should term a fraud. Truth of fact has little value to the Oriental;

[1] Matt. xiv. 2; xvi. 14; xvii. 3–13. Mark vi. 14, 15; viii. 28. Luke ix. 8, 9, 19.

he sees everything through the medium of his preconceived ideas, his interest, or his passions.

History is impossible if we do not frankly admit that there are many standards of sincerity. Faith knows no other law than the interest of that which it believes to be true. The aim it pursues being absolutely holy in its eyes, it makes no scruple of appealing to bad arguments for its cause, where good ones do not succeed. If one proof is not sound, so many others are! If one prodigy is not real, so many others have been! How many pious men, convinced of the truth of their religion, have sought to conquer the obstinacy of other men by means whose weakness they saw quite clearly! How many stigmatists,[1] convulsionaries,[2] and hysterical nuns have been carried away by the influence of the world in which they lived, and by their own belief in feigned acts, either so as not to be outdone by others, or to uphold the cause when in danger! All great things are done by the people; but the people can be led only by one who lends himself to their ideas. The philosopher who, knowing this, secludes and intrenches himself in his nobleness is highly praiseworthy. But one who takes humanity with its illusions, and seeks to act with it and upon it, cannot be blamed. Cæsar knew well that he was not the son of Venus. France would not be what it is, if it had not for a thousand years believed in the Holy Flask of Rheims. It is no doubt easy for us, powerless that we are, to call this falsehood; and, proud of our timid honesty, to calumni-

[1] [Persons held, like Saint Francis, to be miraculously marked with the impress of the wounds of Christ.]

[2] [See, for illustrations, Lanfrey, *L'Église et les Philosophes au dix-huitième siècle.*]

ate the heroes who have accepted the battle of life under other conditions. When we with our scruples have effected what they accomplished by their falsehoods, we shall have the right to be severe upon them. At least, we ought to see how widely a community like ours, where everything takes place in the full light of reflection, differs from those, simple and credulous, in which the beliefs that have governed ages have been born. Nothing great has been established which does not rest on a legend. All the guilt in such cases is due to the humanity which is eager to be deceived.

CHAPTER XVI.

MIRACLES.

Two means of proof — miracles and the fulfilment of prophecy — could alone, as the contemporaries of Jesus held, confirm a supernatural mission. Jesus, and above all his disciples, employed these two modes of proof in perfect good faith. He had been long convinced that the Prophets had written only with him in view. He recognised himself in their sacred oracles; he regarded himself as the mirror in which all the prophetic spirit of Israel had read the future. The Christian school, perhaps even in the lifetime of its founder, sought to prove that Jesus answered perfectly to what the Prophets had predicted of the Messiah.[1] In many cases these adaptations were quite superficial, and are hardly perceptible to us. They were most frequently fortuitous or insignificant circumstances in the life of the Master, which recalled to the disciples certain passages of the Psalms and the Prophets, in which, by reason of the postulate they constantly assumed, they saw images of what was passing before their eyes.[2] The exegesis of the time consisted thus almost entirely in a play upon words, and in quotations made in an artificial and arbitrary manner.[3] The synagogue had no officially

[1] For example, Matt. i. 22; ii. 5, 6, 15, 18; iv. 15.

[2] Matt. i. 23; iv. 6, 14; xxvi. 31, 54, 56; xxvii. 9, 35. Mark xiv. 27; xv. 28. John xii. 14, 15; xviii. 9; xix. 19, 24, 28, 36.

[3] We see the same thing on almost every page of the Talmud.

settled list of the passages which related to the coming kingdom. Messianic applications of prophecy were quite free, and constituted artifices of style far more than serious argument.

As to miracles, at that time they were regarded as indispensable marks of divinity, and as signs of the prophetic vocation. The legends of Elijah and Elisha were full of them. It was assumed that the Messiah would perform many.[1] In Samaria, a few leagues from where Jesus was, a magician named Simon acquired almost a divine character by his artifices.[2] Afterwards, when it was sought to give like reputation to Apollonius of Tyana, and to prove that his life had been the sojourn of a god upon the earth, it was not thought possible to succeed without inventing for him a vast cycle of miracles.[3] The Alexandrian philosophers themselves, Plotinus and the rest, are reputed to have done the like.[4] Jesus was, therefore, obliged to choose between the two alternatives, — either to renounce his mission, or to become a wonder-worker (*thaumaturgus*). It must be borne in mind that all antiquity, with the exception of the great scientific schools of Greece and their Roman disciples, accepted the miraculous; and that Jesus not only believed in it, but also had not the least idea of an order of Nature controlled by laws. His knowledge on this point was not at all superior to that of his contemporaries. Still further, one of his most deeply rooted opinions was that by faith and prayer man has entire power over Nature.[5] The

[1] John vii. 34; 4 Esdras, xiii. 50. [2] Acts viii. 9–11.

[3] See his biography by Philostratus.

[4] See Lives of the Sophists by Eunapius; Life of Plotinus by Porphyry; of Proclus, by Marinus; of Isidore, ascribed to Damascius.

[5] Matt. xvii. 19; xxi. 21, 22. Mark xi. 23, 24.

faculty of performing miracles was held to be a privilege regularly conferred by God upon men,[1] and there was nothing surprising in it.

The lapse of time has changed that which constituted the power of the great Founder into something offensive to our ideas; and if ever the worship of Jesus loses its hold upon humanity, it will be precisely on account of those acts which created faith in him. Criticism is not in the least embarrassed by such historical phenomena. A miracle-worker of our day, unless of an extreme simplicity, — as in the case of certain German stigmatists, — is odious; for he performs miracles without believing in them: he is a mere charlatan. But if we take a Francis of Assisi, the question becomes altogether different: the cycle of miracles attending the origin of the Franciscan Order, far from offending us, affords us real pleasure. The founders of Christianity lived in at least as complete a state of poetic ignorance as did Santa Clara and the "three companions." The disciples deemed it quite natural that their master should have interviews with Moses and Elijah, that he should command the elements, and that he should heal the sick. We must remember, besides, that every idea loses something of its purity when it attempts to realise itself in act. Success is never attained without some chafing of the soul's delicacy. Such is the feebleness of the human mind, that the best cause rarely wins except by bad arguments. The demonstrations of the first apologists of Christianity rest upon very poor reasonings. Moses, Christopher Columbus, Mahomet, have triumphed over obstacles only by daily taking account of the weakness of men, and

[1] Matt. ix. 8.

by not always giving true reasons for the truth. It is probable that those about Jesus were more struck by his miracles than by his profoundly divine discourses Let us add that doubtless popular rumour, both before and after his death, enormously exaggerated the number of this class of facts. The types of the Gospel miracles do not, indeed, present much variety; they are repetitions of one another, and seem fashioned upon a very small number of models, adapted to the taste of the country.

It is impossible, among the miraculous accounts recorded to weariness in the Gospels, to distinguish the miracles attributed to Jesus by common consent from those in which he consented to play an active part. In particular, we cannot know whether the repellent circumstances attending them — the efforts, distress, groanings, and other features savouring of jugglery [1] — are really historical, or whether they result from the belief of the compilers, strongly prepossessed as they were with the notion of magic, and living, in this regard, in a world like that of the "spirits" of our day.[2] Popular opinion, in fact, insisted that the divine virtue was in man (as it were) a condition like epilepsy or convulsion.[3] Almost all the miracles that Jesus believed he performed appear to have been miracles of healing. Medicine was at that period in Judæa what it still is in the East, — that is to say, far from being scientific, and absolutely given over to individual inspiration. Scientific medicine,

[1] Luke viii. 45, 46; John xi. 33, 38.

[2] Acts ii. 2–13; iv. 31; viii. 15–19; x. 44–47. For almost a century the apostles and their converts dream only of miracles: see Acts, the Pauline writings, Papias in Euseb. iii. 39 etc.; and compare Mark iii. 15, and xvi. 17, 18, 20.

[3] Mark v. 30; Luke vi. 3, and viii. 46; John xi. 33, 38.

founded by Greece five centuries before, was at the time of Jesus almost wholly unknown to the Jews of Palestine. In such a state of knowledge, the presence of a superior man, treating the patient with gentleness, and giving him by some tangible signs an assurance of recovery, is often a decisive remedy. Who would dare to say that in many cases, apart of course from well-defined lesions, the touch of a rare personality is not worth more than all the resources of pharmacy? The mere pleasure of seeing such a one is healing. He gives what he can, — a smile, a hope; and these are not in vain.

Jesus had no more idea than the majority of his countrymen of a rational medical science; he shared the general belief that healing was to be effected by religious methods. Such a belief was perfectly self-consistent. From the moment that disease was regarded as the punishment of sin,[1] or as the act of a demon,[2] and in no way as the result of physical causes, the best physician was the holy man who had power in the supernatural world. Healing was regarded as a moral act: Jesus, who was conscious of moral power, must needs believe himself specially gifted to heal. Convinced that the touch of his robe, the laying on of his hands, the application of his saliva,[3] benefited the sick, it would have been hard if he had refused to the sufferers a solace which it was in his power to bestow. The healing of the sick was considered as one of the signs of the kingdom of God, and was always connected with the emancipation of the poor.[4] Both were signs of

[1] John v. 14; ix. 1–3, 34.
[2] Matt. ix. 32, 33; xii. 22. Luke xiii. 11, 16.
[3] Luke viii. 43–45; iv. 40. Mark viii. 23. John ix. 6.
[4] Matt. xi. 5; xv. 30, 31. Luke ix. 1, 2, 6.

the great revolution that was to culminate in the relief of all infirmities. The Essenes, who were in so many ways closely akin to Jesus, passed also for very powerful spiritual physicians.[1]

One of the classes of cure which Jesus most frequently performed was exorcism, or the casting out of demons. A strange readiness to believe in demons pervaded all minds. It was a universal opinion, not only in Judæa, but everywhere, that demons take possession of the bodies of certain persons and make them act contrary to their will. A Persian *div*, often called in the Avesta[2] *Aëschmadaëva* (the "spirit of evil desire"), adopted by the Jews under the name *Asmodeus*,[3] was made the cause of all hysterical disturbances in women.[4] Epilepsy, mental and nervous maladies in which the patient seems no longer to belong to himself,[5] and infirmities whose cause is obscure, — such as deafness and dumbness,[6] — were explained in the same manner. The admirable treatise *De morbo sacro* [epilepsy], by Hippocrates, which set forth the true principles of treatment in this malady four centuries and a half before Jesus, had not banished from the world so great an error. It was supposed that there were processes more or less efficacious for driving away the demons; and the occupation of exorcist was a regular profession like that of physician.[7] There is no doubt that Jesus had in his

[1] See *ante*, p. 102, *note*. [2] *Vendidad*, xi. 26; *Yaçna*, x. 18

[3] Tobit iii. 8; vi. 14. Babylonian Talmud, *Gittin*, 68 *a*.

[4] Comp. Mark xvi. 9; Luke viii. 3. Gospel of the Infancy, 16, 33; Syrian code in Land's *Anecdota Syriaca*, i. 152.

[5] Josephus, *Wars*, VII. vi. 2. Lucian, *Philopseud.* 16. Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius*, iii. 30; iv. 20. Aretæus, *De causis morb. chron.* i. 4.

[6] Matt. ix. 33; xii. 22. Mark ix. 16, 24. Luke xi. 14.

[7] Tobit viii. 2, 3. Matt. xii. 27. Mark ix. 38. Acts xix. 13. Josephus, *Antiq.* VIII. ii. 5. Justin, *Tryph.* 85. Lucian, *Epigr.* 23.

lifetime the reputation of possessing the profoundest secrets of this art.[1] There were then many lunatics in Judæa, doubtless the result of the great general excitement. These madmen, who were allowed to roam about, as they still are in the same districts, inhabited the abandoned sepulchral caverns which were the ordinary retreat of vagrants. Jesus had much control over these unfortunates.[2] A score of singular stories are related of his cures, in which the credulity of the time had full scope. But these difficulties must not be exaggerated. The disorders described as "possessions" were often very slight. In our time, in Syria, people are regarded as mad or possessed by a demon (these two ideas are expressed by the same word, *medjnoun*)[3] who are only eccentric on some point. A gentle word is often enough in such cases to drive away the demon. Such were doubtless the means employed by Jesus. Who knows if his celebrity as an exorcist was not spread almost without his own knowledge? Persons who reside in the East are occasionally surprised to find themselves, after some time, in great reputation as doctors, sorcerers, or discoverers of treasures, without being able to account to themselves for the facts which have given rise to these strange fancies.[4]

[1] Matt. xvii. 20; Mark ix. 24–29.

[2] Matt. viii. 28; ix. 34; xii. 43–45; xvii. 14–21. Mark v. 1–15. Luke viii. 27–36.

[3] The phrase "thou hast a devil" (Matt. xi. 18; Luke vii. 33; John vii. 20, viii. 48, and x. 20) should be rendered "thou art mad," — in Arabic, *mejnoun enté*. In all classic antiquity the verb δαιμονᾶν signifies "to be insane."

[4] A man who had to do with recent movements of sectaries in Persia informed me, that, having established in his neighbourhood a sort of freemasonry, on a footing greatly enjoyed, he presently found himself ranked as a prophet, and was astonished at hearing daily of the prodigies he had

Many circumstances, too, seem to show that Jesus performed such acts only toward the end of his career, and against his inclination. He often executes the marvel after urgent entreaty, and with a degree of reluctance, reproaching those who clamour for them for their "hardness of heart."[1] One singularity, apparently inexplicable, is the care he takes to perform such deeds in secret, and the request he makes of those whom he heals to tell no one.[2] When the demons wish to proclaim him the Son of God, he forbids them to open their mouths; but they recognise him in spite of himself.[3] These traits are especially prominent in Mark, who is pre-eminently the evangelist of miracles and exorcisms. It would seem that the disciple who has furnished the chief data of this Gospel wearied Jesus with his admiration for prodigies; and that the Master, annoyed by a reputation which weighed upon him, had often said to him, "Say nothing about it." Once this discordance evoked a singular outburst,[4] a fit of impatience, in which the annoyance to him caused by these perpetual demands of weak minds betrays itself. One would say, at times, that the character of wonder-

performed. A multitude of people were ready to die for him. His popular fame (*légende*) ran before him, as it were, and would have dragged him along if the Persian government had not put him out of the reach of his disciples. This man told me that he had himself come very near being made a prophet; that he had learned in that way how such things happen, and that they take place just as I had described them in the *Life of Jesus*.

[1] Matt. xii. 39; xvi. 4; xvii. 16. Mark viii. 17–21; ix. 18. Luke ix. 41; xi. 29.

[2] Matt. viii. 4; ix. 30, 31; xii. 16–20. Mark i. 44; vii. 24–30; viii. 26.

[3] Mark i. 24, 25, 34, and iii. 12; Luke iv. 41. Compare the Life of Isidore, ascribed to Damascius, 56.

[4] Matt. xvii. 16; Mark ix. 18; Luke ix. 41.

worker is disagreeable to him, and that he seeks to give as little publicity as possible to the marvels which, so to speak, spring up under his feet. When his enemies ask a miracle of him, especially a celestial miracle, a "sign from heaven," he obstinately refuses.[1] We may therefore believe that his reputation of thaumaturgist was forced upon him; that he did not much resist it, but also that he did nothing to aid it; and that, at all events, he felt the vanity of public opinion on this point.

We should be lacking in true historical method if in this we should give too much weight to our distaste. The essential thing for the true critic is to comprehend the difference of time, and to divest himself of those ingrained habits which are the result of a purely rational education. We must not, to escape the objections we might be tempted to raise against the character of Jesus, suppress facts which his contemporaries would regard as most essential of all.[2] It would be convenient to say that these are the additions of disciples much inferior to their Master, who, unable to conceive his true grandeur, have sought to exalt him by illusions unworthy of him. But the four narrators of the life of Jesus are unanimous in extolling his miracles. One of them, Mark, spokesman of the Apostle Peter,[3] insists so much on this point, that, if we were to trace the features of the Christ only according to this Gospel, we should think of Jesus as an exorcist who possessed some talisman of rare efficacy, — a very potent sorcerer, who inspired fear, and whom people wished to

[1] Matt. xii. 38, 39; xvi. 1–4. Mark viii. 11. Luke xi. 29–32.
[2] Josephus, *Antiq.* XVIII. iii. 3.
[3] Papias in Euseb. iii. 39.

escape from.[1] We will admit, then, without hesitation, that acts which would now be considered as showing illusion or insanity held a large place in the life of Jesus. Must we sacrifice to this uninviting aspect the sublime features of such a life? No such thing! A mere sorcerer would not have brought about a moral revolution like that effected by Jesus. If the miracle-monger had effaced in him the moralist and the religious reformer, not Christianity but a school of magic would have been the issue.

The same question, moreover, meets us in the same way respecting all saints and religious founders. Things now seen to be morbid, such as epilepsy and visions, were once a source of power and greatness. Medical science can name the disease which made the success of Mahomet.[2] Almost till our own day, the men who have done most for the good of their kind — including the excellent Vincent de Paul himself — have been thaumaturgists, whether they would or no. If we set out with the principle that every historical personage to whom acts have been attributed which we in the nineteenth century hold to be irrational or savouring of quackery was either a madman or a charlatan, all criticism is at fault. The school of Alexandria was a noble school, but still it soon lapsed into the practices of an extravagant theurgy. Socrates and Pascal were not exempt from hallucinations. Facts ought to be explained by

[1] Mark vi. 40; v. 15, 17, 33; vi. 49, 50; x. 32: cf. Matt. viii. 27, 34; ix. 8; xiv. 27; xvii. 6, 7; also Luke iv. 36; v. 17; viii. 25, 35, 37; ix. 34. The apocryphal gospel of Thomas the "Israelite" carries this feature to the most shocking absurdity. Compare the "Miracles of the Infancy" in Thilo, *Cod. apocryph. N. T.*, p. cx. *note.*

[2] The *hysteria muscularis* of Schönlein (Sprenger: *Das Leben und die Lehre des Mohammad*, i. 207 *et seq.*).

causes adequate to them. The weaknesses of the human mind engender only weakness; great things are always brought about by what is great in the nature of man, though they often involve a train of littlenesses which, to superficial minds, eclipse their grandeur.

In a general way, then, it is true to say that Jesus was a wonder-worker and exorcist only in spite of himself. As it always happens in a great and divine career, he submitted to, far more than he performed, the miracles demanded by public opinion. Miracle is commonly the work of the public, not of him to whom it is attributed. Jesus might have refused ever so firmly to perform his prodigies; still the multitude would have invented them for him. The greatest of miracles would have been his refusal to perform any: never would the laws of history and popular psychology have been more completely set at naught. He was no more free than Saint Bernard or Saint Francis of Assisi to check the appetite of the multitude and of his own disciples for the marvellous. His miracles were a violence done to him by his age, a concession forced from him by the necessity of the hour. The exorcist and the thaumaturgist have alike passed away; but the religious reformer will live forever.

Even those who did not believe in Jesus were struck with these acts, and were eager to be witnesses of them.[1] The Pagans, and persons unacquainted with him, had a feeling of dread, and tried to induce him to remove from their district.[2] Many thought, perhaps, to take advantage of his name for seditious projects.[3] But

[1] Matt. xiv. 1, 2. Mark vi. 14. Luke ix. 7; xxiii. 8.

[2] Matt. viii. 34; Mark v. 17; Luke viii. 37.

[3] John vi. 14, 15: comp. Luke xxii. 36–38.

the purely moral and no way political motive and aim of Jesus saved him from these entanglements. His own kingdom was in the group of children whom a like freshness of imagination and the same foretaste of heaven had gathered and still retained around him.

CHAPTER XVII.

CONCEPTIONS OF THE DIVINE KINGDOM.

We assume that this last phase of the activity of Jesus continued about eighteen months, — from the Passover pilgrimage of the year 31 until his journey to the Feast of Tabernacles in the year 32.[1] During that interval his conception appears not to have been enriched by any new element; but all that was in him developed and expanded with ever-increasing power and boldness.

The ground-idea of Jesus from the first was the establishment of the kingdom of God. But this kingdom, as we have already said, appears to have been understood by him in very different senses. At times he might be taken for a democratic leader, desiring only the reign of the poor and the disinherited. At other times the kingdom of God is the literal fulfilment of the apocalyptic visions concerning the Messiah. Or, again, this kingdom is often conceived as the realm

[1] John v. 1; vii. 2. In the scheme of the Fourth Gospel the public life of Jesus seems to be reckoned as lasting two or three years. The Synoptics give no clear statement as to this, though their view seems to bring all the incidents within the compass of one year. (Compare the similar opinion of the Valentinians in Irenæus, *Adv. hær.* I. i. 3; II. xxii. 1, 2; also that of the Clementine *Homilies*, xvii. 19.) If, as would appear, the life of Jesus ended A. D. 33, we get from Luke iii. 1 a duration of five years. In any case, since Pilate was deposed in A. D. 36, the public career of Jesus cannot have exceeded seven years. The uncertainty on this point comes, no doubt, from the fact that the beginning of his public life was an event not so precisely defined as is generally supposed.

of souls, and the near deliverance is deliverance by the Spirit. The revolution desired by Jesus is, in this view, that which has actually taken place, — the establishment of a new worship, purer than that of Moses. All these thoughts appear to have existed together in his mind. The first, however, — that of a temporal revolution, — does not appear to have had long hold upon him: Jesus never regarded the earth, or the riches of the earth, or material power, as a thing worth caring for. He had no ambition for outside things. Sometimes, naturally enough, his great religious authority was on the point of becoming a real social force. People would come and urge him to make himself judge or umpire in matters that touched their interests. Jesus disdainfully rejected these proposals, almost as a personal affront.[1] Full of his heavenly ideal, he never abandoned his austere poverty. As to the other two conceptions of the kingdom of God, — the messianic and the spiritual, — Jesus appears always to have held them in a single grasp. If he had been a mere enthusiast, led astray by the apocalypses on which the popular imagination fed, he would have remained an obscure sectary, inferior to those whose ideas he followed. If he had been a mere Puritan, a sort of Channing, or "Savoyard vicar," he would certainly have gained no success. The two parts of his system — or, rather, his two conceptions of the kingdom of God — sustain each other; and this reciprocal support has made his incomparable success. The first Christians were visionaries, living in a circle of ideas which we should call waking dreams; but, at the same time, they were the heroes of that social war which has resulted in emancipating the conscience, and in found-

[1] Luke xii. 13, 14.

ing a religion from which the pure worship proclaimed by the founder will at length emerge.

The apocalyptic ideas of Jesus, in their completest form, may be summed up as follows: —

The existing order of humanity is reaching its term. This crisis will be a prodigious revolution, an "anguish" like the pains of childbirth;[1] in the phrase of Jesus himself, a "regeneration" (παλιγγενεσία),[2] or new birth, preceded by dark calamities and heralded by strange phenomena.[3] In the full daylight, the sign of the Son of Man will blaze out in the sky. This will be a vision, with thunderings and brightness like that of Sinai; a mighty tempest shall rend the heavens; a flash of fire shall shoot, in the twinkling of an eye, from east to west. The Messiah will "come with clouds,"[4] arrayed in glory and majesty, to the sound of trumpets and surrounded by angels. His disciples will sit upon thrones beside him. The dead will then arise, and the Messiah will go forth to judgment.[5]

[1] [Matt. xxiv. 8: ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων.] [2] Matt. xix. 28.

[3] Matt. xxiv. 3–14; Mark xiii. 4–8; Luke xvii. 22–30, and xxi. 7–11, 25–28. It should be noted that the picture of "the end of the age," here ascribed by the Synoptics to Jesus, contains many features which belong to the siege of Jerusalem [A. D. 70]. Luke wrote some time after this siege (xxi. 9, 20, 24); while the composition of Matthew, on the contrary (xxiv. 15, 16, 22, 29), brings us to the very moment of the siege, or just after. No doubt, however, Jesus foretold great terrors as sure to precede his reappearance. These terrors were an essential feature in every Jewish apocalypse, — Enoch xcix. c. cii. ciii. (Dillmann's division); Carm. Sibyll. iii. 334, 633; iv. 168, and v. 511, with the verses following; Assumption of Moses, chaps. 5, 6 (ed. Hilgenfeld); Apocalypse of Baruch in Ceriani, *Monum.* I. ii. 79 *et seq.* In Daniel, also, the reign of the saints will not come till the desolation shall have reached its height (vii. 25–27; viii. 23–26; ix. 26, 27; xii. 1–3).

[4] Comp. Dan. vii. 13; Carm. Sibyll. iii. 286, 652; Revel. i. 7.

[5] Matt. xvi. 27; xix. 28; xx. 21; xxiii. 39; xxiv. 30, 31; xxv. 31–33; xxvi. 64. Mark xiv. 62. Luke xiii. 35; xxii. 30, 69. 1 Cor. xv. 52;

In this judgment men will be divided into two classes according to their works,[1] and the sentence will be put in execution by angels.[2] The elect will enter into an abode of joy prepared for them from the foundation of the world,[3] where they will be seated, clothed with light, at a feast presided over by Abraham,[4] the patriarchs, and the prophets: these will be the smaller number.[5] The rest will depart into Gehenna. This was a valley westward of Jerusalem, where the worship of fire had been practised at various times, and the place had become a kind of cesspool: thus the name came in the mind of Jesus to mean a dark, filthy, underground pit, full of fire.[6] Those excluded from the kingdom will there be burned and eaten by worms, in company with Satan and his rebel angels;[7] and there will be wailing and gnashing of teeth.[8] The kingdom of heaven will be as a closed hall, lighted from within, in the midst of a world of darkness and torments.[9] This new order of things will be eternal. Paradise and Gehenna will have no end. An impassable abyss separates the one from the other.[10] The Son of Man,

1 Thess. iv. 15–17. Here the Christian idea departs widely from the Jewish: see 4 Esdras v. 56–vi. 6; xii. 33, 34.

[1] Matt. xiii. 38–43; xxv. 33.

[2] Matt. xiii. 39, 41, 49.

[3] Matt. xxv. 34: comp. John xiv. 2.

[4] Matt. viii. 11; xiii. 43; xxvi. 29. Luke xiii. 28; xvi. 22; xxii. 30.

[5] Luke xiii. 23-30.

[6] Comp. Babylonian Talmud, *Schabbath*, 39 *a*.

[7] Matt. xxv. 41. The idea of fallen angels, so developed in the Book of Enoch, was universally believed in by those directly about Jesus: see Jude 6, 7; 2 Peter ii. 4, 11; Revel. xii. 9; Luke x. 18; John viii. 44.

[8] Matt. v. 22; viii. 12; x. 28; xiii. 40, 42, 50; xviii. 8; xxiv. 51; xxv. 30. Mark ix. 43–49.

[9] Matt. viii. 12; xxii. 13; xxv. 30. Comp. Josephus, *Wars*, III. viii. 5.

[10] Luke xvi. 28.

seated on the right hand of God, will preside over this final condition of the world and of humanity.[1]

That all this was taken literally by the disciples, and by the Master himself at certain moments, is clearly evident in the writings of the time. If the first Christian generation had one profound and constant belief, it was that the world was very near its end,[2] and that the great "revelation"[3] of the Christ was soon to take place. The startling proclamation, "The time is at hand," which commences and closes the Apocalypse;[4] the incessantly reiterated appeal, "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear,"[5] — were the words of hope and rallying-cries of the whole apostolic age. A Syrian phrase, *Maran atha*, "Our Lord cometh,"[6] became a sort of password, which the believers used among themselves in order to strengthen their faith and their hope. The Apocalypse, written in the year 68 A. D.,[7] fixes the end at three years and a half.[8] The "Ascension of Isaiah"[9] adopts a calculation closely approaching this.

[1] Mark iii. 29; Luke xxii. 69; Acts vii. 55.

[2] Luke xviii. 8; Acts ii. 17, and iii. 19, 20; 1 Cor. xv. 23, 24, 52; 1 Thess. iii. 13, iv. 14-17, and v. 23; 2 Thess. ii. 1-11 (here ἐνέστηκεν, in the second verse, indicates a crisis close at hand; while Paul denies that the end is so near, but in verses 7, 8, asserts that it is very near); 1 Tim. vi. 14; 2 Tim. iv. 1-8; Titus ii. 13; James v. 3, 8; Jude 16-21; 2 Pet. chap. iii.; Revel. throughout, — in particular, i. 1; ii. 5, 16; iii. 11; vi. 11; xi. 14; xxii. 6, 7, 12, 20. Compare 2 Esdras iv. 26.

[3] Luke xvii. 30; 1 Cor. i. 7, 8; 2 Thess. i. 7; 1 Pet. i. 7, 13; Revel. i. 8.

[4] Revel. i. 3; xxii. 10 (comp. i. 1).

[5] Matt. xi. 15; xiii. 9, 43. Mark iv. 9, 23; vii. 16. Luke viii. 8; xiv. 35. Revel. ii. 7, 11, 27, 29; iii. 6, 13, 22; xiii. 9.

[6] 1 Cor. xvi. 22.

[7] Revel. chap. xvii. The sixth emperor here given (v. 10) as the one who "now is," is Galba; the "beast about to come," whose "number" is given in cipher (xiii. 18), is Nero.

[8] Revel. xi. 2, 3; xii. 6, 14. Comp. Dan. vii. 25; xii. 7.

[9] Chap. iv. 12, 14 (comp. Cedrenus, p. 68: Paris, 1647).

Jesus never went to such precision. When he was questioned as to the time of his advent, he always refused to reply; once he even declares that the date of this great day is known only to the Father, who has revealed it neither to the angels nor to the Son.[1] He said that the time when the kingdom of God was most anxiously expected was just that in which it would not appear.[2] He constantly repeated that it would be a surprise, as in the times of Noah and of Lot; that we must be on our guard, always ready to depart; that each one must watch and keep his lamp trimmed as for a wedding procession, which arrives unforeseen;[3] that the Son of Man would come like a thief, at an hour when he would not be expected;[4] that he would appear as a flash of lightning, running from one end of the heavens to the other.[5] But his declarations as to the nearness of the catastrophe leave no room for any equivocation.[6] "This generation," said he, "will not pass away till all these things are fulfilled. Many of those standing here will not taste of death till they have seen the Son of Man coming in his kingdom."[7] He reproaches those who do not believe in him for not being able to read the signs of the future kingdom. "When it is evening, you say, 'It will be fair weather; for the sky is red.' And in the morning, 'It will be

[1] Matt. xxiv. 36; Mark xiii. 32.

[2] Luke xvii. 20; comp. Babylonian Talmud, *Sanhedrin*, 97 *a*.

[3] Matt. xxiv. 36–41. Mark xiii. 32–35. Luke xii. 35–40; xvii. 20, 21.

[4] Luke xii. 40; 2 Pet. iii. 10.

[5] Luke xvii. 24.

[6] Matt. x. 23; xxiv.–xxv. throughout, in particular xxiv. 29, 34. Mark xiii. 30. Luke xiii. 35; xxi. 28–33.

[7] Matt. xvi. 28; xxiii. 36, 39; xxiv. 34. Mark viii. 39. Luke ix. 27; xxi. 32.

foul weather to-day; for the sky is red and lowering.' You who can judge the face of the sky, can you not discern the signs of the times?"[1] By an illusion common to all great reformers, Jesus imagined the end to be much nearer than it was; he did not take into account how slow are the movements of humanity; he thought to realise in one day that which eighteen centuries later would still be unaccomplished.

These formal declarations preoccupied the Christian family for nearly seventy years. It was admitted that some of the disciples would see the day of the final revelation before dying. John, in particular, was considered as being of this number;[2] some believed that he would never die. Perhaps this was a later opinion suggested toward the end of the first century by the advanced age which John seems to have reached: this longevity, it seems, had given occasion to the belief that God wished to prolong his life indefinitely until the great day, in order to realise the words of Jesus. When he died in his turn, the faith of many was shaken, and his disciples attached a more qualified meaning to the prediction of the Christ.[3]

At the same time that Jesus fully admitted the apocalyptic beliefs, such as we find them in the apocryphal Jewish books, he admitted the dogma which is the complement, or rather the condition, of them all, — namely, the resurrection of the dead. This doctrine, as we have already said,[4] was still somewhat new

[1] Matt. xvi. 2–4; Luke xii. 54–56.

[2] John xxi. 22, 23.

[3] Chap. xxi. of the Fourth Gospel is an addition, as shown by the closing formula of the previous portion in chap. xx. 31. But the addition followed closely the publication of this Gospel.

[4] See *ante*, p. 117.

in Israel; many people either did not know it, or did not believe in it.[1] It was the faith of the Pharisees, and of the fervent adherents of the messianic beliefs.[2] Jesus accepted it unreservedly, but always in the most idealistic sense. Many imagined that after the resurrection they would eat, drink, and marry. Jesus, indeed, admits into his kingdom a new passover, a table, and a new wine; but he expressly excludes marriage.[3] The Sadducees had on this subject an argument, apparently coarse, but at bottom quite in keeping with the old theology. It will be remembered, that, according to the ancient sages, man survived only in his children. The Mosaic code had consecrated this patriarchal theory by a singular institution, — the *levirate*.[4] The Sadducees drew thence plausible inferences against the resurrection, which Jesus evaded by formally declaring that in the life eternal there would no longer exist difference of sex, and that men would be like the angels.[5] Sometimes he seems to promise resurrection only to the just, while the punishment of the wicked consists in complete annihilation.[6] Oftener, however, he declares that the wicked share in the resurrection to their eternal confusion.

Nothing in all these theories, as we see, was abso-

[1] Mark ix. 9; Luke xx. 27–38.

[2] Dan. xii. 2, 3. 2 Macc. vii.; xii. 45, 46; xiv. 46. Acts xxiii. 6, 8. Josephus, *Antiq.* XVIII. i. 3; *Wars*, II. viii. 14, and III. viii. 5.

[3] Matt. xxvi. 29; Luke xxii. 30.

[4] [The right of a childless widow to claim in marriage the deceased husband's brother: see Deut. xxv. 5–10].

[5] Matt. xxii. 24–28; Luke xx. 34–38; Ebionite Gospel ("of the Egyptians") in Clem. Alex. *Strom.* ii. 9, 13; Clem. Rom. *Epist.* ii. 12; Babylonian Talmud, *Berakoth*, 17 *a*.

[6] Luke xiv. 14; xx. 35, 36. So Paul: 1 Cor. xv. 23–28; 1 Thess. iv. 12–17 (see *ante*, p. 117): comp. 4 Esdras, ix. 22.

lutely new. The Gospels and the writings of the Apostles scarcely contain any apocalyptic opinion but what is found already expressed in "Daniel," "Enoch," the "Sibylline Oracles," and the "Assumption of Moses," which are of Jewish origin.[1] Jesus accepted these ideas, which were widely current among his contemporaries. He made them his base of action, or rather one of his bases; for he had too profound a sense of his true work to establish it solely upon grounds so frail, so exposed to the crushing refutation of events.

It is evident, indeed, that such a doctrine, taken literally by itself, had no future. The world, in continuing to endure, put it completely at default. It could at most appeal to but one generation of men. The faith of the first Christian generation is intelligible; but the faith of the second generation is no longer so. After the death of John, or of the last survivor (whoever he might be) of the group that had seen the Master, his word was convicted of falsehood.[2] If the doctrine of Jesus had been simply belief in an approaching end of the world, it would certainly now be sleeping in oblivion. What, then, has saved it? The great breadth of the gospel view, which has allowed men to find, under the same symbol, ideas suited to widely different moods of mind. The world has not ended, as Jesus himself foretold, and as his disciples believed. But it has been renewed, and in a measure renewed as Jesus wished. It is because his thought was two-sided that it has been fruitful. His illusion

[1] Dan. ii. vi.–viii. x.–xiii.; Enoch i. xciii. 9, 56; also xlv.–lvii. lxii. (perhaps interpolated); Carm. Sibyll. iii. 573, 652, 766, 795 *et seq.*; Assumption of Moses, Hilgenfeld, *N. T. extra can. rec.* p. 99 *et seq.*

[2] The distress thus given to the Christian conscience is ingenuously reflected in 2 Peter iii. 8–10 (probably of the date here referred to).

has not had the fate of so many others which have crossed the human mind, because it concealed a seed of life; and this, once introduced (though under a husk of fable) into the human heart, has there brought forth unperishing fruit.

Nor should it be urged that this is an interpretation of mere good-will, invented to clear the honour of our great Master from the cruel denial of his dream which the event has brought about. No, no! this true kingdom of God — this kingdom of the spirit, which makes each man king and priest; this kingdom which like the grain of mustard-seed has become a tree overshadowing the world, among whose branches the birds have their nests — was understood, wished for, founded by him. Beside the false, cold, and impossible idea of an official advent, he conceived the true City of God, the genuine new birth, the Sermon on the Mount, the ennobling of the weak, the love of the people, tenderness to the poor, the strengthening anew of all that is humble, true, and simple. This rehabilitation he has depicted, as an incomparable artist, by features which will last forever. Each of us is in debt to him for that which is best in himself. Let us overlook his hope of a vain apocalypse, of a second coming in great triumph upon the clouds of heaven. Perhaps this was the error of others rather than his own; and if it be true that he himself shared the general illusion, what matters it, since his dream strengthened him in the face of death, and sustained him in a struggle to which he might otherwise have been unequal?

We must, then, attach several meanings to the City of God as conceived by Jesus. If his only thought had been that the end of time was near, and that we must

prepare for it, he would not have gone beyond John the Baptist. To renounce a world just about to crumble, to loose one's hold little by little upon the present life, and to aspire to the kingdom about to come, — such would have been his final lesson. The teaching of Jesus had always a much larger scope. He proposed to himself to create a new moral condition of mankind, and not merely to prepare for the end of that which exists. Elijah or Jeremiah, reappearing to prepare men for the supreme crisis, would not have preached as he did. This is so true that this assumed morality of the latter day is found to be the eternal morality, that which has saved the world. Jesus himself, in many a case, employs modes of speech which do not enter at all into the apocalyptic theory. He often declares that the kingdom of God is already begun; that every man bears it within himself, and can, if he be worthy, enjoy it; that each one silently creates this kingdom by the true conversion of the heart.[1] The kingdom of God is therefore only goodness itself, — a better order of things than that now existing; the reign of justice, which the faithful, according to their ability, ought to help establish; or, again, the liberty of the soul, something like the Buddhist "deliverance," the outgrowth of solitude.[2] These truths, which to us are pure abstractions, were living realities to him. Everything in his thought is concrete and substantial. Of all who have ever lived, he is the man of most vigorous faith in the reality of the ideal.

Accepting the generous illusions of his time and race, Jesus succeeded in making of them lofty truths, by virtue

[1] Matt. vi. 10, 33. Mark xii. 34. Luke xi. 2; xii. 31; xvii. 21-24.

[2] See especially Mark xii. 34.

of certain fertile misconceptions. His kingdom of God was no doubt the apocalyptic vision about to be displayed in the heavens. But it was still, and probably above all, the kingdom of the soul, consisting in liberty and the sense of sonship which the good man feels when resting on the bosom of his Father. It was pure religion, without form, without temple, without priest; the moral judgment of the world, delegated to the conscience of the righteous man and to the arm of the people. This is what was destined to live; this is what has lived. When, at the end of a century of idle waiting, the materialistic hope of a near end of the world had faded out, the true kingdom of God began to appear. "Reconciling" interpretations threw a veil over the real kingdom, which refused to come. Obstinate minds — like Papias, who held literally to the words of Jesus — were treated as narrow and behind the age.[1] The Apocalypse of John, the first book (properly speaking) of the New Testament,[2] was too deeply coloured by the idea of an immediate catastrophe, and so was degraded to a lower rank, held to be unintelligible, tortured in a thousand ways, and almost thrust aside.[3] At least, its fulfilment was adjourned to an indefinite future. Some poor belated ones who in a fully enlightened age still

[1] Iren. *Adv. hær.* V. xxxiii. 3, 4; Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* iii. 39.

[2] Justin, *Tryph.* 81.

[3] In the Greek Church it was long denied a place in the canon: Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* iii. 25, 28, 39, and vii. 25; Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catech.* iv. 33, 36, and xv. 16; Greg. Nazianzen, *Carm.* p. 261, 1104 (ed. of Caillan); Council of Laodicea, *Canon* 60; Nicephorus, *Chronogr.*, p. 419 (Paris, 1652, list at the end). The Armenian Church also makes the book of doubtful canonicity: Sarkis Schnorhali, quoted in *Exercice de la fo hr'et.*, with the approval of the Catholicos Nerses: Moscow, 1850 (in Armenian). Finally, the Apocalypse is wanting in the old *Peshito* version [the Syriac "vulgate," of the third and fourth century].

cherished the hopes of the first disciples, became heretics (Ebionites, Millenarians), lost in the shallows of Christianity. Mankind had passed on to another kingdom of God. The degree of truth contained in the thought of Jesus had prevailed over the illusion that obscured it.

Let us not, however, despise this illusion, which has been the coarse rind of the sacred fruit by which we live. This fanciful kingdom in the heavens, this endless pursuit after a City of God, which has filled the thought of Christianity during its long career, has been the germ of that great instinct of futurity which has animated all reformers, persistent believers in the Apocalypse, from Joachim of Flora down to the Protestant sectary of our days. This impotent effort to establish a perfect society has been the source of the extraordinary tension which has always made the true Christian an athlete, struggling against the present. The idea of the "kingdom of God," and the Apocalypse which is the complete image of it, are thus, in a sense, the highest and most poetic expression of human progress. No doubt, they must also have given rise to great errors. The end of the world, held up as a perpetual menace over mankind, was, by the periodical panics which it caused during centuries, a great hindrance to all secular development.[1] Society, being no longer certain of its existence, fell into a sort of chronic trembling, and into those habits of abject humility which rendered the Middle Age so inferior to antiquity and to modern times.

A profound change had also taken place in the mode of regarding the coming of Christ. When it was first an-

[1] See, for example, the prologue of Gregory of Tours to his "Ecclesiastical History of the Franks."

nounced to mankind that the end of the world was at hand, it experienced the greatest access of joy that it had ever felt, — like a child, who welcomes death with a smile. But as it grew old the world became attached to life. The day of grace, so long expected by the simple souls of Galilee, became to these iron ages a day of wrath, — *Dies iræ, dies illa !* But even in the heart of barbarism the idea of the kingdom of God continued fruitful. Certain documents of the early Middle Age, beginning with the form "Whereas the end of the world draws near," are charters of emancipation. Sects, religious orders, and holy persons continued, in spite of the feudal Church, to protest in the name of the gospel against the iniquity of the world. Even in our days, — troubled days, in which Jesus has no more genuine followers than those who seem to deny him, — dreams of an ideal organisation of society, so like the aspirations of the first Christian sects, are in one sense but the blossoming-out of the same idea: they are but one branch of that immense tree which holds in germ all thought of a future, whose root and stem will be evermore the "kingdom of God." All the social revolutions of humanity will be grafted on this phrase. But, steeped in a coarse materialism and aspiring to the impossible, — that is to say, to found universal happiness upon political and economical measures, — the "socialist" attempts of our time will remain unfruitful until they take as their rule the true spirit of Jesus: I mean, absolute idealism, — the principle that to possess the world we must renounce the world.

The phrase "kingdom of God," on the other hand, expresses with rare felicity the need which the soul feels of a supplementary destiny, as a makeweight

against the present life. Those who do not accept the definition of man as a compound of two substances, and who find the deist dogma of the immortality of the soul a contradiction to physiology, love to fall back upon the hope of a final reparation, which under some unknown form shall satisfy the wants of the human heart. Who knows if the final term of progress, after millions of ages, may not bring to pass the absolute consciousness of the universe; and, in this, the awakening of all that has ever lived? A sleep of a million of years is not longer than the sleep of an hour. Saint Paul, on this supposition, would still be right in saying, "In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye."[1] It is certain that moral and virtuous humanity will have its recompense; that one day the ideas of the honest poor will judge the world; and that on that day the ideal figure of Jesus will be the confusion of the frivolous who have not believed in virtue, and of the selfish who have not been able to attain it. The favourite phrase of Jesus continues, therefore, full of perpetual beauty. A majestic divination seems here to have guided the incomparable Master, retaining him in a field of vision sublime but vague, which embraces in one view various orders of truth the most unlike.

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 52.

CHAPTER XVIII.

WHAT JESUS FOUNDED

A FURTHER proof that Jesus was never entirely absorbed in his apocalyptic visions is, that, while he was most preoccupied with them, he laid with singular precision the ground-work of a Church destined to endure. It is hardly possible to doubt that he himself chose from among his disciples those who were pre-eminently called the "Apostles," or the "Twelve;" since directly after his death we find them forming a distinct body, and filling up by election the vacancy that had occurred in their number.[1] They were these: the two sons of Jonas, the two sons of Zebedee, James son of Alphæus, Philip, Nathanael bar-Tolmai, Thomas, Matthew, Simon Zelotes, Thaddæus or Lebbæus, and Judas of Kerioth.[2] It is probable that the idea of the twelve tribes of Israel had had something to do with the choice of this number.[3] The Twelve, at all events, formed a group of privileged disciples, among whom Peter maintained a fraternal priority,[4] and to them Jesus confided the propagation of his work. There was nothing, however, to suggest a regularly organised priestly order. The

[1] Matt. iv. 1–4. Mark iii. 13–19. Luke vi. 13. John vi. 70; xiii. 18; xv. 16. Acts i. 13–26. 1 Cor. xv. 5. Gal. i. 10. Revel. xxi. 12.

[2] Besides the above, see Papias in Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* iii. 39.

[3] Matt. xix. 28; Luke xxii. 30.

[4] Acts i. 15; ii. 14; v. 2, 3, 29; viii. 19; xv. 7. Gal. i. 18.

lists of the Twelve which have been preserved show sundry uncertainties and contradictions; two or three of those who figure in them remained completely obscure. Two, at least, Peter and Philip,[1] were married and had children.

Jesus evidently reserved secrets to the Twelve, which he forbade them to communicate to everybody.[2] It appears at times to have been his intention to surround his person with some mystery; to keep back the most important testimony till after his death; to reveal himself clearly only to his disciples, confiding to them the later task of manifesting him to the world.[3] "What I tell you in darkness, declare in open daylight; and what I whisper in your ear, speak out upon the housetops." He was thus spared the need of declaring himself too precisely, and created a kind of medium between the public and himself. It is certain that he had private instructions for the Apostles, and that he explained to them many parables whose meaning he left obscure to the multitude.[4] An enigmatical turn, and a certain odd way of connecting ideas, were in vogue among the teachers of the day, as we see in the sentences of *Pirké Aboth*. Jesus explained to his nearer disciples what was peculiar in his maxims or apologues, and for them he stripped his teaching of the wealth of illustration which sometimes obscured it.[5] Many

[1] Concerning Peter, see *ante* p. 187; concerning Philip, see the testimonies of Papias, Polycrates, and Clement of Alexandria in Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* iii. 30, 31, 39; v. 24.

[2] Matt. xvi. 20; xvii. 9. Mark viii. 30; ix. 8.

[3] Matt. x. 26, 27; xvi. 20. Mark iv. 21, 22; viii. 30. Luke viii. 17; ix. 21; xii. 2, 3. John xiv. 22. Epistle of Barnabas, 5.

[4] Matt. xiii. 10–13, 34, 35; Mark iv. 10–12, 33, 34; Luke viii. 9, 10 and xii. 41.

[5] Matt. xvi. 6–12; Mark vii. 17–23.

of these explanations appear to have been carefully preserved.[1]

During the lifetime of Jesus the Apostles preached,[2] but without ever departing far from him. Their preaching, moreover, was confined to announcing the speedy coming of the kingdom of God.[3] They went from town to town, receiving hospitality, or rather taking it themselves, according to custom. The guest in the East has much authority; he is superior to the master of the house, who puts the greatest confidence in him. This fireside preaching is well suited to the propagation of new doctrines. The hidden treasure is shared, and payment is thus made for what is received; politeness and good feeling lend their aid; the household is touched and converted. Remove Oriental hospitality, and it would be impossible to explain the propagation of Christianity. Jesus, who kept close to the good old ways, charged his disciples to make no scruple of profiting by this ancient public right, probably abolished already in the great towns where there were hostelries.[4] "The labourer," said he, "is worthy of his hire." Once installed in the house, they were to remain there, eating and drinking what was offered them as long as their mission lasted.[5]

Jesus desired that, following his example, the messengers of the "glad tidings" should recommend their preaching by mild and courteous manners. He directed that on entering a house they should bestow upon it the *salaam*, or invocation of peace. Some hesitated, —

[1] Matt. xiii. 18-23; Mark vii. 18-23.

[2] Luke ix. 6.

[3] Luke x. 11.

[4] The Greek word πανδοκεῖον has been adopted in all tongues of the East as signifying an inn.

[5] Mark vi. 10.

the *salaam* being then, as now, in the East a sign of religious communion, which is not risked with persons of a doubtful faith.[1] "Fear nothing," said Jesus; "if no one in the house is worthy of your salute, it will come back to you."[2] Sometimes, in fact, the Apostles of the kingdom of God were ill received, and complained to Jesus, who generally sought to soothe them. Some of them, persuaded of the omnipotence of their Master, were hurt at this forbearance. The sons of Zebedee wished him to call down fire from heaven upon the inhospitable towns.[3] Jesus received these outbursts with his keen irony, and stopped them by saying, "I am not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them."

He sought in every way to establish as a principle that his Apostles were as himself.[4] It was believed that he had communicated his marvellous gifts to them. They cast out demons, prophesied, and formed a school of renowned exorcists,[5] though certain cases were beyond their power.[6] They also made cures, either by laying on hands or by anointing with oil,[7] one of the simple operations of Oriental medicine. Lastly, like the *Psylli*,[8] they could handle serpents and drink with impunity deadly potions.[9] As we get further from Jesus, this quackery becomes more and more offensive.

[1] 2 John 10, 11. [2] Matt. x. 11–13; Luke x. 5–7.

[3] Luke ix. 52–56.

[4] Matt. x. 40–42; xxv. 35–40. Mark ix. 40. Luke x. 16. John xiii. 20.

[5] Matt. vii. 22; x. 1. Mark iii. 15; vi. 13. Luke x. 17.

[6] Matt. xvii. 18, 19.

[7] Mark vi. 13; xvi. 18. James v. 14.

[8] [A Libyan tribe, of the district now Tripoli, mentioned by Herodotus, xiv. 173.]

[9] Mark xvi. 18; Luke x. 19.

But there is no doubt that it was of common acceptance in the primitive Church, and that it held a chief place in the estimation of the world around.[1] Charlatans, as might have been expected, practised upon this phase of popular credulity. Even in the lifetime of Jesus, many who were not his disciples cast out demons in his name. The true disciples were much offended at this, and sought to prevent them. Jesus, who saw in this a tribute to his good name, did not show himself severe towards them. It must be observed, moreover, that these supernatural gifts had, so to speak, become a trade. Carrying the logic of absurdity to the extreme, certain men cast out demons by Beelzebub,[2] the prince of demons. They imagined that this prince of the infernal legions must have entire authority over his subordinates, and that in acting through him they were sure to drive away the intruding spirit.[3] Some even sought to buy from the disciples of Jesus the secret of the miraculous powers which had been conferred upon them.[4]

The germ of a Church now began to appear. This fertile idea of the power of men in association (*ecclesia*) seems indeed to have been Jesus' own idea. Full of his purely ideal doctrine that union in love brings souls into one another's presence, he declared that whenever they should assemble in his name he would be in the midst of them. He confided to the Church the right to bind or loose, — that is, to render certain things lawful or unlawful; to remit sins, to reprimand, to warn with authority, and to pray with the certainty of being

[1] Mark xvi. 20.

[2] An ancient Philistine divinity, regarded by the Jews as a demon.

[3] Matt. xii. 24–29. [4] Acts viii. 18–24.

heard.[1] It is possible that many of these sayings were attributed to the Master, so as to give a foundation to the collective authority by which in later time it was sought to replace that of Jesus. At all events, it was not till after his death that particular churches were getting to be established; and this first constitution, besides, was made purely and simply on the model of the synagogue. Many who had loved Jesus much, and had founded great hopes upon him, — such as Joseph of Arimathea, Mary of Magdala, and Nicodemus, — did not, it would seem, enter these churches, but clung to the tender or revering memory which they had cherished of him.

Moreover, there is no trace in the teaching of Jesus of an applied morality, or of a canonical code ever so slightly defined. Once only, respecting marriage, he speaks with decision, and forbids divorce.[2] Neither was there any theology or creed, — at most, certain views respecting the Father, the Son, and the Spirit,[3] from which, afterwards, were inferred the Trinity and the Incarnation; but these still remained in a state of vague symbol or imagery. The later books of the Jewish canon recognise already in the Holy Spirit a sort of divine *hypostasis*, sometimes identified with Wisdom or the Word.[4] Jesus insisted upon this point,[5] and made claim to give his disciples a baptism by fire and by the Spirit,[6] much holier than that of John. In

[1] Matt. xviii. 18–20; John xx. 23. [2] Matt. xix. 3–11.

[3] Matt. xxviii. 19 (comp. iii. 16, 17); John xv. 26.

[4] Wisdom i. 7; vii. 7; ix. 17; xii. 1. Eccles. i. 9; xv. 5; xxiv. 27; xxxix. 8. Judith xvi. 17.

[5] Matt. x. 20; Luke xii. 12, and xxiv. 49; John xiv. 26, and xv. 26.

[6] Matt. iii. 11; Mark i. 8; Luke iii. 16; John i. 26, and iii. 5; Acts i. 5, 8, and x. 47.

his view, this Holy Spirit was not distinct from the inspiration proceeding from God the Father continuously.[1] Upon this they subtilised. They imagined that Jesus had promised his disciples to send them after his death, to fill his place, a Spirit that should teach them all things, and bear witness to the truths he had himself proclaimed.[2] One day the Apostles thought they received the baptism of this Spirit in the form of a great wind and pointed flames ("tongues") of fire.[3] In order to designate this Spirit, people made use of the word *Paraklit* (borrowed in Syro-Chaldaic from the Greek), which appears to have had in this case the meaning of "advocate" or "counsellor,"[4] or, again, "interpreter of celestial truths," or "teacher charged to reveal to men the hitherto hidden mysteries."[5] It is very doubtful whether Jesus made use of this word. It was in this case an application of the process which both the Jewish and the Christian theology would follow through centuries, thus producing a whole series of associate divinities, — the *Metathronos*, the *Synadelphos* (Sandalphon), and all the personifications of the Cabala. The difference is that in Judaism these creations remain free and individual speculations; while Christianity, from the fourth century down, made of them the very essence of orthodoxy and of the universal creed.

It is needless to remark how remote from the thought of Jesus was the idea of a religious book

[1] Matt. x. 20; Mark. xiii. 11; Luke xii. 12, and xxi. 15.

[2] John xv. 26; xvi. 13, 16. Comp. Luke xxiv. 49; Acts i. 8.

[3] Acts ii. 1–4; xi. 15; xix. 6. Comp. John vii. 39.

[4] John xiv. 16; 1 John ii. 1. To the Advocate (Παράκλητος) was opposed the Accuser (Κατήγορος).

[5] John xiv. 26; xv. 26; xvi. 7–11. The word is peculiar to the Fourth Gospel and to Philo (*De mundi opificio*, 6).

containing a code and articles of faith. Not only did he not write, but it was contrary to the spirit of the infant sect to produce sacred books. Men believed themselves on the eve of the great final catastrophe. The Messiah was on his way to put seal upon the Law and the Prophets, not to promulgate new texts. Thus, excepting the Apocalypse (which was, in a sense, the only revealed book of primitive Christianity),[1] the compositions of the apostolic age are occasional writings, which make no claim to furnish a complete dogmatic whole. The Gospels had at first an entirely personal character, and in authority were far inferior to tradition.[2]

Had not the sect, however, some sacrament, some rite, some rallying-point? It had one, which all traditions carry back to Jesus. One of the favourite images of the Master is that he was the new bread, — a bread very superior to manna, — on which mankind was to live. This idea, the germ of the Eucharist, took in his mouth at times singularly concrete forms. On one occasion, especially, in the synagogue of Capernaum, he took a bold step, which cost him several of his disciples. "Yes, in truth, I say to you, it is not Moses, it is my Father, who gives you the bread from heaven."[3] And he added, "I am the bread of life: he that comes to me shall never hunger, and he that believes on me shall never thirst."[4] These words excited sharp murmurs. "What does he mean," said they, "by calling himself 'the bread of life'? Is not this Jesus the son of Joseph,

[1] Justin, *Tryph.* 81.

[2] Papias, in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* iii. 39.

[3] John vi. 32–35.

[4] A similar turn of expression, leading to a like misunderstanding, is found in John iv. 10–14.

whose father and mother we know? How can he say, 'I came down from heaven'?" But Jesus, insisting with still more force, said, "I am the bread of life; your fathers ate manna in the wilderness, and are dead. This is the bread which is come down from heaven, that the man who eats of it may not die. I am the living bread; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever: and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world."[1]

The ill-feeling was now at its height: "How can he give us his flesh to eat?" Jesus, going still further, replied, "Yes, in truth, I say to you, Except you eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, you will have no life in you. He that eats my flesh and drinks my blood has eternal life; for my flesh is truly food, and my blood is truly drink. He that eats my flesh and drinks my blood dwells in me, and I in him. As I live by the Father who has sent me, so he that eats me shall live by me." Such paradoxical obstinacy offended several of his disciples, who ceased to follow him. Jesus did not retract; he only added: "It is the Spirit that gives life. Flesh counts for nothing. The words that I speak to you are spirit and life." The Twelve remained faithful, despite this strange appeal. It gave to Cephas, in particular, the occasion to show his absolute devotion, by proclaiming once more, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God."

It is probable that at this time there had been established at the common table of the disciples some usage or custom, referred to in the discourse so ill received by

[1] All this is too strongly stamped with the peculiar style of the Fourth Gospel to allow us to think it the genuine language of Jesus. Still, the incident is not to be regarded as wholly without historic reality.

the people of Capernaum. But the apostolic traditions on this subject are very divergent and (it is probable) purposely incomplete. The Synoptics, whose account is confirmed by Saint Paul, suppose a special sacramental act serving as basis to the mysterious rite, and make the last supper of Jesus with his disciples the occasion of it.[1] The Fourth Gospel, which has duly preserved to us the incident in the synagogue at Capernaum, does not speak of such an act, though it describes the last supper at great length. Elsewhere we see Jesus recognised in the breaking of bread,[2] as if this had been to those who associated with him the most characteristic of his customary acts. When he was dead, the form under which he appeared to the pious memory of his disciples was as presiding at a mysterious banquet, — taking the bread, blessing it, breaking and giving it to those present.[3] We may suppose that this was one of his habits, and that at such times he was particularly moved to tenderness. One material circumstance, the presence of fish upon the table (a striking indication, which proves that the rite was instituted on the shore of Lake Tiberias[4]), was itself almost sacramental, and became an essential part of the sacred feast as pictured in the disciples' memory.[5]

[1] Matt. xxvi. 26–29; Mark xiv. 22–25; Luke xxii. 14–20; 1 Cor. xi. 23–26.

[2] Luke xxiv. 30, 35.

[3] Luke *loc. cit.*; John xxi. 13; Gospel of Hebrews in Jerome, *De viris illustribus*, 2.

[4] Comp. Matt. vii. 10; xiv. 17–21; xv. 34–38. Also Mark vi. 38–44; Luke ix. 13–17, xi. 11, and xxiv. 42; John vi. 9–13 and xxi. 9–13. The basin of Lake Tiberias is the only part of Palestine where fish makes a considerable portion of the diet.

[5] John xxi. 13; Luke xxiv. 42, 43. Compare the oldest representations of the Eucharist as reported or corrected by Rossi in his dissertation

The repast in common had become one of the sweetest moments of the infant community. At these times they all assembled; the Master spoke to each, and kept up a conversation full of cheer and charm. Jesus loved these seasons, and was pleased to see his spiritual family thus grouped around him.[1] By Jewish custom the master of the house, at the beginning of the meal, took the bread, blessed it with a brief invocation, broke it, and then offered it to each of those at the board. The wine was blessed in like manner.[2] Among the Essenes and Therapeutæ, the sacred feast had already taken the ritual importance afterwards given to the Christian eucharist.[3] Sharing in the same bread was considered as a kind of communion, or reciprocal bond.[4] Jesus used, in this respect, extremely strong terms, which were afterwards taken in a wildly literal sense. He was at once very idealising in his conceptions and very realistic in his expression of them. Wishing to express the thought that the believer lives by him, that altogether (body, blood, and soul) he is the life of the truly faithful, he would say to his disciples, "I am the food by which you live," — a phrase which, in figurative style, became, "My flesh is your bread; my blood is

on the ΙΧΘΥΣ ("fish:" Dom Pitra's *Spicilegium Solesmense*, iii. 568 *et seq.*; comp. Rossi, *Bull. di arch. crist.*, 3d year, pp. 44, 73 *et seq.*). It is true that small fish were, like bread, an indispensable part of every meal (see the inscription of Lanuvium, 2d col. 16, 17). The acrostic contained in the word ΙΧΘΥΣ [Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς Θεοῦ Υἱὸς Σωτήρ] was no doubt allied with an older tradition on the importance of the fish in the primitive meal of the disciples.

[1] Luke xxii. 15.

[2] Matt. xiv. 19; Luke xxiv. 30; Acts xxvii. 35; Babylonian Talmud, *Berakoth*, 37 *b*. This is still the Jewish custom.

[3] [For a description of this feast see Renan's *History of Israel*, v. 318-322]; also Philo, *De vita contempl.* 6–11; Josephus, *Wars*, II. viii. 7.

[4] Acts ii. 46; xx. 7, 11. 1 Cor. x. 16–18.

your drink." The modes of speech he employed, always strongly realistic, carried him yet further. At the table, pointing to the food, he would say, "This is myself;" then, holding the bread, "This is my body;" again, holding the wine, "This is my blood," — all modes of speech which were equivalent to, "I am the food by which you live."

This mystical rite was held of high value while Jesus was yet alive. It was probably established some time before the last journey to Jerusalem, and was the result of a general doctrine much more than a determinate act. After his death, it became the great symbol of Christian communion,[1] and its establishment was referred to the most solemn moment of his life. The disciples wished to see in the consecration of bread and wine a farewell memorial which, at the moment of quitting life, he had left to them.[2] They found him again in this sacrament.[3] The wholly spiritual idea of the presence of souls, one of the most familiar to the Master, — which made him say, for instance, that he was personally with his disciples[4] when they were assembled in his name, — rendered this easily admissible. Jesus, we have already said,[5] never had a sharply defined notion of that which constitutes individuality. At the stage of exaltation to which he had attained, the idea so overrode everything else with him that the body counted for nothing. We are one when we love one another, when we live the one by the other: how, then, were not he and his disciples one?[6] His disciples adopted the

[1] Acts ii. 42, 46.
[2] Luke xxii. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 20–26; Justin, *Tryph.* 41, 70; *Apol.* i. 66.
[3] 1 Cor. x. 16.
[4] Matt. xviii. 20.
[5] See *ante*, p. 258.
[6] John, chap. xii. throughout.

same language.[1] Those who for years had lived by him always saw him holding the bread and then the cup "betwixt his holy and venerable hands,"[2] and thus offering himself to them. It was *he* whom they ate and drank; he became the true passover, the former one having been abolished by his blood. It is impossible to translate into our essentially hard-and-fast modes of speech, where we must always sharply distinguish between the proper meaning and the metaphor, those turns of phrase which by their very essence ascribe objective reality to the metaphor, or, rather, to the idea it represents.

[1] Ephes. iii. 17.

[2] Words of a very ancient canon of the Greek and Latin Mass.

CHAPTER XIX.

DEEPENING GLOW AND STRESS.

It is clear that such a religious society, founded solely on the expectation of a divine kingdom, must be in itself very incomplete. The first Christian generation lived almost entirely upon hopes and dreams. On the eve of seeing the world come to an end, it estimated as vain endeavour whatever served only to prolong the world's existence. The desire of property was regarded as a sinful thing.[1] Whatever attaches man to earth, whatever draws him aside from heaven, must be shunned. Though several of the disciples were married, it would seem that marriage was no longer contracted after one became a member of the sect.[2] Celibacy was distinctly preferred.[3] At one time the Master seems to approve of those who should mutilate themselves in view of the kingdom of God.[4] In this he acted up to his precept, "If thy hand or thy foot cause thee to offend, cut them off, and cast them from thee; it is better for thee to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet to be cast into Gehenna. And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee; it is better for

[1] Matt. xix. 21; Luke xiv. 33; Acts iv. 32–35, and v. 1–11.
[2] Matt. xix. 10–12; Luke xviii. 29, 30.
[3] This is the constant teaching of Paul: comp. Revel. xiv. 4.
[4] Matt. xix. 12.

thee to enter into life with one eye, rather than having both eyes to be cast into Gehenna."[1] An end of all conjugal relations was further held to be the sign and condition of the kingdom of God.[2]

It will be seen that this primitive Church would never have formed a durable society, but for the great variety of elements embraced in the teaching of Jesus. It yet required more than a century for the true Christian Church — that which has converted the world — to disengage itself from this little sect of "latter-day saints," and to become a framework suited to human society as a whole. The same was also the case with Buddhism, which at first was founded only for monks. The same thing would have happened in the Franciscan Order, if that Order had succeeded in its claim to become a rule for the whole of human society. Being utopian in their origin, and succeeding by their very extravagance, the great systems just spoken of did not spread over the world till they had been profoundly modified, and had abandoned their excesses. Jesus himself never went beyond this first purely monastic stage, in which one thinks he can attempt the impossible with impunity. He made no concession to necessity. He boldly preached war against Nature, and a total rupture with the ties of blood. "In truth, I declare to you," said he, "whatever man has left house or parents or brethren or wife or children, for the kingdom of God's sake, shall receive a hundred-fold more in this present time, and in the world to come life eternal."[3]

[1] Matt. xviii. 8, 9: comp. Babylonian Talmud, *Niddah*, 13 *b*.

[2] Matt. xxii. 30; Mark xii. 25; Luke xx. 35; Ebionite Gospel of the Egyptians, in Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iii. 9, 13; Clem. Rom. Ep. ii. 12.

[3] Luke xviii. 29, 30.

The instruction which Jesus is represented to have given his disciples breathes the same exaltation.[1] He, so lenient with the outside world, at times satisfied with mere half-way adhesions, shows extreme rigour towards his own. He would have no "all buts." We might call it an "order," founded upon the austerest rules. True to his idea that the cares of life trouble and debase man, Jesus requires of his companions a complete detachment from the earth, an absolute devotion to his work. They must carry with them no money or provisions for the way, not even a wallet or change of clothes. They must practise absolute poverty, live on alms and hospitality. "What you have received freely, give freely," said he, in his own noble words.[2] Arrested and arraigned before the judges, let them prepare no defence; the heavenly Advocate will inspire them as to what they shall say. The Father will confer upon them his spirit from on high. This Spirit will control all their acts, direct their thoughts, and guide them through the world.[3] When driven from a city, let them shake off the dust from their shoes upon it, and thus, lest it plead ignorance, testify that the kingdom of God is near. "Before you have gone over the cities of Israel," he added, "the Son of Man will appear."

A strange glow pervades all these discourses. They may be in part the creation of the disciples' enthusiasm;[4] but even in this case they came indirectly from Jesus,

[1] Matt. x. (throughout); xxiv. 9. Mark vi. 8–11; ix. 40; xiii. 9–13. Luke ix. 3–5; x. 1–7; xii. 4–12; xxi. 17. John xv. 18–21; xvii. 14.

[2] Matt. x. 8: comp. Midrash Ialkout, *Deuteron.* § 824.

[3] Matt. x. 20. John xiv. 16, 17, 25–27; xvi. 7, 13.

[4] The expressions in Matt. x. 38 and xvi. 24, in Mark viii. 34 and Luke xiv. 27, must have been conceived after the death of Jesus.

since such enthusiasm was his work. He warns those who wish to follow him of bitter persecutions and the hatred of mankind. He sends them forth as lambs in the midst of wolves. They will be scourged in the synagogues, and dragged to prison. Brother will betray his brother, and the father his son. When they are persecuted in one country, let them flee to another. "The disciple," said he, "is not above his master, nor the servant above his lord. Fear not those who kill the body, but have no power upon the soul. Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? and one of them shall not fall to the ground but as your Father permits. Nay, the very hairs of your heads are all numbered. Fear nothing, then; you are of more value than many sparrows."[1] "Whoever," he said again, "shall confess me before men, him I will confess before my Father; but whoever shall be ashamed of me before men, him I will deny before the angels when I come in the glory of my Father who is in heaven."[2]

In these moments of severity he went the length of trampling upon the flesh. His requirements no longer have any bounds. Despising the healthy limits of man's nature, he would insist that one should exist only for him, should love no one but him alone. "If any man come to me," said he, "and hate not his father, his mother, his wife, his children, his brethren, his sisters, even his own life, he cannot be my disciple."[3] So too, "If any one of you shall not renounce all that he has, he cannot be my disciple."[4] Something strange and more than

[1] Matt. x. 24–31; Luke xii. 4–7.

[2] Matt. x. 32, 33; Mark viii. 38; Luke ix. 26 and xii. 8, 9.

[3] Luke xiv. 26. Allowance should be made for the vein of exaggeration in Luke.

[4] Luke xiv. 33.

human was at such times mingled in his speech; it was like a fire which consumes the life at its root, and reduces everything to a dreary waste. The harsh and gloomy sense of repugnance to the world, and the excessive self-abnegation which is the mark of Christian perfection, had as its source, not the light-hearted and cheerful moralist of the earlier day, but the sombre prophet whom a certain deep presentiment withdraws more and more beyond the pale of humanity. We might say that in these moments, when warring against the most legitimate cravings of the heart, he had forgotten the joy of life, of love, of sight, of feeling. Going beyond all measure, he dared to say, "If any man will be my disciple, let him deny himself and follow me! He that loves father or mother more than me is not worthy of me; and he that loves son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me. To cling to life is to be lost; to sacrifice your life for me and the good cause is to be saved. What does it help a man if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?"[1]

Two anecdotes, which we may accept not as historical, but as intended to depict a trait of character by exaggerating it, clearly illustrate this defiance of Nature. He said to one man, "Follow me!" "Master," replied the man, "suffer me first to go and bury my father." Jesus answered, "Let the dead bury their dead: but do you go and proclaim the kingdom of God." Another said to him, "Master, I will follow thee; but let me first go and put in order the affairs of my house." Jesus replied, "No man who has put his hand to the plough,

[1] Matt. x. 37–39; xvi. 24–26. Mark viii. 34–37. Luke ix. 23–25; xiv 26, 27; xvii. 33. John xii. 25.

and looks back, is fit for the kingdom of God."[1] An extraordinary assurance, and at times accents of singular sweetness, surpassing all our ideas, smoothed the way to these exaggerations. "Come to me," cried he, "all that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn from me that I am meek and lowly in heart; and you shall find rest to your souls. For my yoke is easy and my burden light."[2]

A great danger might result to the future from this exalted morality, expressed in hyperbolical language of terrible energy. By thus detaching man from earth, the life was crushed. A Christian would be praised for being a bad son or a bad patriot, if it was for Christ that he resisted his father or fought against his country. The ancient City, — the Republic, mother of all, — the State, or law common to all, — were thus set in hostility against the kingdom of God. A fatal germ of theocracy was introduced into the world.

Another consequence now begins to be perceived. When transported into peaceful circumstances, into the bosom of a society assured of its own duration, this morality, constructed for a time of crisis, must seem impossible. The gospel was thus destined to become for Christians a utopia, which very few would give themselves the pains to put in practice. These overwhelming maxims must for the greater number sleep in a profound oblivion encouraged by the clergy itself; for the gospel man will be a dangerous man. The most selfish, proud, hard, unpoetic of all human beings — a Louis XIV. for instance — must find priests to persuade him, in spite of the gospel, that he is a

[1] Matt. viii. 21, 22; Luke ix. 56–62. [2] Matt. xi. 28–30.

Christian. But, on the other hand, there must always be found holy men, who accept to the letter the sublime paradoxes of Jesus. Since perfection is placed beyond the ordinary conditions of society, since a complete gospel life can be led only at a distance from the world, the principle of asceticism and monastic life is laid down. Christian societies would have two moral rules, — the one, moderately heroic, for common men; the other, exalted in the extreme, for the perfect man: and the perfect man would be the monk, subjected to rules which profess to realise the gospel ideal. It is certain that this ideal, were it only for the obligation of celibacy and poverty, could not become the common rule. The monk is thus, in some respects, the only true Christian. Good common-sense revolts at these excesses: to believe in that, is to believe that to demand the impossible is a sign of weakness and error. But good common-sense is a bad judge where great things are at stake. To get a little from humanity, we must ask much. The immense moral progress we owe to the gospel results from its exaggerations. Thus it has been, like Stoicism, though with infinitely greater fulness, a living argument for the divine energies in man, a monument erected to the power of the will.

We may readily imagine that Jesus, at this period of his life, had absolutely lost sight of everything which did not belong to the kingdom of God. He was (if we may say so) totally outside Nature: family, friendship, country, had no longer any meaning for him. From this moment, no doubt, he had already sacrificed his life. At times we are tempted to believe that, seeing in his own death a means of founding his kingdom, he conceived of deliberate purpose the thought of causing

himself to be put to death.[1] At other times (though such a thought was not erected into a doctrine till a later day) death presented itself to him as a sacrifice, destined to appease his Father and to save mankind.[2] A singular craving for persecution and torments[3] grew upon him. His blood appeared to him as the water of a second baptism into which he must be plunged, and he seemed possessed by a strange haste to anticipate this baptism, which alone could quench his thirst.[4]

The grandeur of his views upon the future was at times surprising. He did not deceive himself as to the terrible storm he was about to cause in the world. "You may think," said he, boldly and nobly, "that I am come to bring peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword. There shall be five in one house divided, — three against two, and two against three. I am come to set a man at variance against his father, the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law. Henceforth a man's foes shall be in his own household."[5] "I am come to cast fire upon the earth; all the better, if it be already kindled!"[6] "They will drive you out of the synagogues," he said again; "and the time will come when a man will think he does God service in killing you."[7] "If the world hate you, know that it hated me before it hated you. Remember the word that I said to you: The servant is not greater than his master. If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you."[8]

Carried away by this tremendous sweep of enthusiasm,

[1] Matt. xvi. 21–23; xvii. 12, 21, 22.
[2] Mark x. 45.
[3] Luke vi. 22, 23.
[4] Luke xii. 50.
[5] Matt. x. 34–36; Luke xii. 51–58: comp. Micah vii. 5, 6.
[6] Luke xii. 49 (see the Greek).
[7] John xvi. 2.
[8] John xv. 18–20.

and governed by the demands of a preaching more and more exalted, Jesus was no longer free; he belonged to his mission and, in a sense, to mankind. Sometimes one might have said that his reason was unbalanced. He suffered great anguish and disturbance of mind.[1] The great vision of the kingdom of God, flaming constantly before his eyes, dazzled him. It must be remembered that at times those about him believed him to be insane,[2] while his enemies declared him to be possessed.[3] His excessively impassioned temperament carried him repeatedly beyond the bounds of human nature. Since his work was not a work of reason, and made sport of all the laws of the human mind, what he most imperiously demanded was "faith." This was the word most frequently repeated in the little guest-chamber.[4] It is the watchword of all popular movements. It is clear that none of these movements would take place if it were necessary that the fomenter of them should gain his disciples, one by one, by force of logic. Reflection leads only to doubt; and if the authors of the French Revolution, for instance, had required to be previously convinced by lengthened meditations, they would all have come to old age without doing anything. Jesus, in like manner, aimed less at intellectual conviction than at moral enthusiasm. Urgent and imperious, he suffered no opposition: you must be converted, — he waits for that. His natural gentleness seems to have abandoned him; he was sometimes harsh and capricious.[5] His disciples at times did not understand him, and felt in his

[1] John xii. 27. [2] Mark iii. 21, 22.
[3] Mark iii. 22. John vii. 20; viii. 48, 49; x. 20, 21.
[4] Matt. viii. 10; ix. 2, 22, 28, 29; xvii. 19. John vi. 29–33.
[5] Matt. xvii. 17; Mark iii. 5 and ix. 19; Luke viii. 45 and ix. 41.

presence a certain sense of fear.[1] His impatience at the slightest opposition would lead him to commit unaccountable and apparently absurd acts.[2]

It was not that his virtue weakened; but his struggle in the cause of the ideal against the actual became insupportable. He was bruised and angered by contact with the soil. Obstacles irritated him. His notion of the Son of God became disturbed and exaggerated. Consciousness of the Deity has its flow and ebb; no man is a child of God all his life long, without intermission. One is such at certain times, through sudden illuminations, and then lost in weary darkness. The fatal law which condemns an idea to loss of vigour as soon as it seeks to convert men, applies to Jesus. Contact with men lowered him to their level. The tone he had adopted could not be sustained beyond a few months. It was time for death to relax the tension of a situation strained to the utmost; to remove him from the impossibilities of a path that had no issue; to deliver him from a trial too prolonged, and introduce him, henceforth above all frailty, into its heavenly repose.

[1] This is especially noticeable in Mark iv. 40, 41; v. 15; ix. 31; x. 32.
[2] Mark xi. 12–14, 20–23 [blasting of the fig-tree].

CHAPTER XX.

OPPOSITION TO JESUS.

During the early period of his career, Jesus does not seem to have met any serious opposition. His preaching, thanks to the extreme liberty enjoyed in Galilee and to the great number of teachers who arose on all sides, made no noise outside a quite narrow circle of persons. But when he entered upon a career brilliant with prodigies and public successes, the storm began to threaten. More than once he was obliged to conceal himself and fly.[1] Antipas, meanwhile, never interfered with him, though Jesus sometimes expressed himself very severely about him.[2] At Tiberias, his usual residence,[3] the tetrarch was only four or five miles distant from the district chosen by Jesus for the field of his activity; he was told of the miracles, which he doubtless took to be clever tricks, and desired to see them.[4] The incredulous were at that time very curious about this sort of jugglery.[5] With his ordinary tact, Jesus refused. He took care not to lose his way in an irreligious world, which wished to extort from him some idle amusement; he aspired only to gain the people; for the simple he reserved means suited to them alone.

[1] Matt. xii. 14–16; Mark iii. 7 and ix. 29, 30.

[2] Mark viii. 15; Luke xii. 32.

[3] Josephus, *Life*, 9; Madden, "History of Jewish Coinage," p. 97 *et seq.*

[4] Luke ix. 9; xxiii. 8.

[5] Lucian, *Lucius* (authorship doubtful), 4.

Once the report went about that Jesus was no other than John the Baptist risen from the dead. Antipas became anxious and uneasy;[1] he employed artifice to rid his dominions of the new prophet. Certain Pharisees, under the pretence of interest in Jesus, came to tell him that Antipas was seeking to kill him. Jesus, despite his great simplicity, saw the snare, and did not depart.[2] His wholly peaceful bearing, and his remoteness from popular agitation, at length reassured the tetrarch and dissipated the danger.

The new doctrine was by no means received with equal favour in all the towns of Galilee. Not only did unbelieving Nazareth continue to reject the man who was to create her glory; not only did his brothers persist in not believing in him,[3] — but even the towns on the lake-shore, though generally friendly, were not all converted. Jesus often complains of the unbelief and hardness of heart which he encounters; and though it is natural, in such reproaches, to allow for some exaggeration in the preacher, — though we hear in it a certain tone of that outcry against the age (*convicium seculi*) which Jesus seems to have caught from John the Baptist,[4] — it is clear that the country was far from thronging in a body to the kingdom of God. "Woe to thee, Chorazin! woe to thee, Bethsaida!" cried he; "for if the mighty works which were done in you had been seen in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes: but I tell you that it will be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the day of judgment than for you. And thou Capernaum, that

[1] Matt. xiv. 1, 2; Mark vi. 14–16; Luke ix. 7–9.
[2] Luke xiii. 31–33.
[3] John vii. 5.
[4] Matt. xii. 39, 45; xiii. 15; xvi. 4. Luke xi. 29.

hast been lifted up to heaven, shalt be brought down to hell; for if the mighty works which have been done in thee had been done in Sodom, it would have remained until this day. It is for this I tell you that it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment than for thee."[1] "The queen of Sheba," he added, "will rise up in the day of judgment against the men of this generation, and will condemn them; for she came from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon, and behold a greater than Solomon is here. The men of Nineveh will rise up in the day of judgment against this generation, and will condemn it; because they repented at the preaching of Jonas, and behold a greater than Jonas is here."[2] His wandering life, at first so full of charm, now began to weigh upon him. "The foxes," said he, "have their burrows, and the birds of the air their nests; but the Son of Man hath not where to rest his head."[3] He accused unbelievers of not yielding to evidence. Bitterness and reproach more and more found lodging in his heart.

Jesus, in fact, could not accept opposition with the coolness of the philosopher, who understands the ground of the various opinions that divide the world, and so finds it quite natural that all should not be of his mind. One of the principal defects of the Jewish race is its bitterness in controversy, and the abusive tone which it almost always mingles in it. There never were in the world such hot disputes as those of the Jews among themselves. It is a sentiment of nice discernment that makes the polite and moderate man. Now, the lack

[1] Matt. xi. 21–24; Luke x. 12–15.
[2] Matt. xii. 41, 42; Luke xi. 31, 32.
[3] Matt. viii. 20; Luke ix. 58.

of this feeling is one of the most constant features of the Semitic mind. Works of refinement in thought or style — such as the Dialogues of Plato, for example — are altogether foreign to people of this race. Jesus, who was exempt from almost all the defects of his race, and whose dominant quality was precisely that of an infinite delicacy, was led in spite of himself to employ the general tone in his attack or defence.[1] Like John the Baptist,[2] he spoke in very harsh terms against his adversaries. Of an exquisite gentleness with the simple, he was embittered in presence of unbelief, however little aggressive.[3] He was no longer the mild teacher who delivered the "Sermon on the Mount," who as yet had met with neither resistance nor difficulty. The passion that underlay his character led him on to the keenest invectives.[4] Thus he applied to himself, not without reason, the passage from Isaiah:[5] "He shall not strive nor cry; neither shall any man hear his voice in the streets. A bruised reed shall he not break, and smoking flax shall he not quench."[6] Yet many of the counsels which he urges upon his disciples contain the germs of a real fanaticism,[7] — germs which in the Middle Age were to grow into a system of extreme cruelty.

Are we to reproach Jesus for this? No great change

[1] Matt. xii. 34; xv. 14; xxiii. 33.

[2] Matt. iii. 7.

[3] Matt. xii. 30; Luke xxi. 23.

[4] This singular mixture ought not to surprise us. A man of our own times, M. de Lamennais, has forcibly presented the same contrast. In his noble book, "The Words of a Believer," the most immoderate anger and the sweetest relentings alternate, as in a mirage. This man, who was extremely gentle in the intercourse of life, became unreasonably obstinate toward those who did not think as he did.

[5] Chap. xlii. 2, 3.

[6] Matt. xii. 19, 20.

[7] Matt. x. 14, 15, 21, 22, 34–39; Luke xix. 27.

is ever brought about without some roughness. If Luther, or the actors in the French Revolution, had been compelled to keep the rules of civility, neither the Reformation nor the Revolution would have taken place. Let us also congratulate ourselves that Jesus encountered no law which punished denunciation aimed at a class of citizens. The Pharisees in that case would have been invulnerable. All great deeds of mankind have been effected in the name of absolute principle. A critical philosopher would have said to his disciples: "Respect the opinion of others; believe that no one is so completely right that his adversary is completely wrong." But the work done by Jesus has nothing in common with the disinterested speculation of the philosopher. For one to say to himself that he has touched the ideal for a moment, but was stopped by the evil temper of certain persons, is something unendurable to an ardent soul. What must it have been for the founder of a new era?

The invincible barrier to the designs of Jesus lay in particular with the Pharisees. He withdrew more and more widely from the form of Judaism reputed orthodox. Now, the Pharisees were the nerve and strength of Judaism. Although this party had its centre at Jerusalem, still it had devoted adherents who either were settled in Galilee or who often came into the North.[1] They were, in general, men of narrow mind, giving much weight to externals; of a devoutness haughty, formal, and self-satisfied.[2] Their manners

[1] Mark vii. 1; Luke v. 17, and vii. 36.

[2] Matt. vi. 2, 5, 16; ix. 11, 14; xii. 2; xxiii. 5, 15, 23. Luke v. 30; vi. 2, 7; xi. 39–41; xviii. 12. John ix. 16. *Pirké Aboth*, i. 16. Josephus, *Antiq.* XVII ii. 4; XVIII. i. 3; also *Life*, 38. Babylonian Talmud, *Sota*, 22 *b*.

were ridiculous, and called up a smile even with those who respected them. The popular nicknames given them, reeking of caricature, prove this. There was the "bandy-legged Pharisee" (*nikfi*), who walked in the streets dragging his feet and knocking them against the stones; the "bloody-browed Pharisee" (*kizai*), who went with his eyes shut in order not to see the women, and would strike his head so hard against the walls that it was always bloody; the "pestle Pharisee" (*medoukia*), who kept himself bent double like the handle of a pestle; the "strong-shouldered Pharisee" (*schikmi*), who walked with his back bent as if he carried on his shoulders the whole burden of the Law; the "What-is-there-to-do ?-I-do-it Pharisee," always on the outlook for a precept to fulfil. To these was sometimes added the "painted Pharisee," whose whole outside show of devotion was but a varnish of hypocrisy.[1] This rigour was, in fact, often only apparent, and concealed at bottom great moral laxity.[2] The people, nevertheless, were duped by it. The people, whose instinct is always right even when it goes farthest astray in personal judgments, is very easily deceived by false devotees. What it loves in them is good, and worthy to be loved; but it has not the penetration to distinguish show from substance.

The antipathy, sure to break out in such a world of passions, between Jesus and people of this character

[1] Mishna, *Sota*, iii. 2; Jerusalem Talmud, *Berakoth*, ix. (end); Babylonian Talmud, *Sota*, 22 *b*. The two readings of this curious passage show marked differences. We have usually followed the Babylonish, which seems the more natural (comp. Epiphan. xvi. 1). The points in Epiphanius, and many in the Talmud, may be referred to a later time, when "Pharisee" had come to be a synonym of "devotee."

[2] Matt. v. 20; xv. 4; xxiii. 3, 16–33. John viii. 7. Josephus, *Antiq.* XII. ix. 1; XIII. x. 5.

is easy to understand. He desired only the religion of the heart: the religion of the Pharisees consisted almost solely in observances. He sought for the humble and rejected of every class: the Pharisees saw in this an insult to their religion as men of respectability. The Pharisee was a man without error and without sin; a pedant, always certain of being in the right; one who took the first place in the synagogue, prayed in the street, gave alms to the sound of a trumpet, and watched to see whether people saluted him or not. Jesus held that each one ought to wait the judgment of God with fear and trembling. The bad religious tendency represented by Pharisaism by no means reigned without restraint. Many men, then or before, — such as Jesus son of Sirach (one of the real progenitors of Jesus of Nazareth), Gamaliel, Antigonus of Soco, and especially the gentle and noble Hillel, — had taught religious truth far more elevated, and almost like the gospel. But these good seeds had been choked. The noble maxims of Hillel, summing up the whole Law as equity;[1] and those of Jesus son of Sirach, making worship to consist in the practice of virtue,[2] — were forgotten or anathematised.[3] Shammai, with his narrow and exclusive mind, had carried the day. An enormous mass of "traditions" had stifled the Law,[4] under the pretext of protecting and interpreting it. No doubt this conservative ethics had had its use: it is well that the Jewish people loved their Law even to madness, inasmuch as this fanatic love, by saving Mosaism under Antiochus Epiphanes and under Herod,

[1] Babylonian Talmud, *Schabbath*, 31 *a*; *Joma*, 35 *b*.
[2] Eccles. xvii. 21–24; xxxv. 1–7.
[3] Jerusalem Talmud, *Sanhedrin*, xi. 1; Babyl. Talmud, ibid. 100 *b*.
[4] Matt. xv. 2.

had preserved the leaven necessary for the production of Christianity. But taken by themselves these obsolete precautions were only puerile. The synagogue, which was the storehouse of them, was no longer anything but the mother of errors. Its reign was over; and yet to ask for its abdication was to ask of it that which an established power has never done and never can do.

The conflicts of Jesus with official hypocrisy were unending. The common practice of reformers who appear under religious conditions such as those we have just described, might be called "traditional formalism;" it is, to oppose the "text" of the sacred books to "traditions." Religious zeal is always an innovator, even when it claims to be most strictly conservative. Just as the neo-Catholics of our day are getting farther and farther away from the Gospel, so the Pharisees at every step got farther from the Bible. This is why the Puritan reformer is as a rule essentially "biblical": he sets out with the unchangeable text to criticise the current theology, which has advanced from generation to generation. Thus in later time did the Karaïtes and the Protestants. Jesus laid the axe to the root of the tree far more energetically. True, we see him at times appealing to the sacred text against the false comment or tradition of the Pharisees.[1] But, in general, he sets little store by exegesis; it is the conscience to which he appeals. With the same stroke he cuts clean through both text and commentary. He shows to the Pharisees, indeed, that by their traditions they seriously pervert Mosaism; but he makes no claim himself to return to Moses. His goal was before him, not behind. Jesus

[1] Matt. xv. 2–6; Mark vii. 2–8.

was more than the reformer of an outworn religion; he was the founder of the eternal religion of humanity.

Disputes broke out, especially in regard to a number of outward practices introduced by tradition, and kept neither by Jesus nor by his disciples.[1] The Pharisees sharply reproached him for this. When he dined with them he would scandalise them greatly by not submitting to the customary ablutions. "Give alms," said he, "and then everything will be clean to you."[2] What more than all the rest wounded his keen sense was the air of assurance which the Pharisees carried into religious acts, their mean-spirited devotion, ending in a vain hunger for precedence and titles, and not the bettering of the heart. An admirable parable expressed this thought with infinite charm and justice. "Two men," said he, "went up into the Temple to pray: one was a Pharisee, and the other a publican. The Pharisee stood and prayed thus with himself: 'God, I thank thee that I am not like other men, — extortioners, unjust, adulterers, — like this publican, for example. I fast twice in the week, I give tithes of all that I possess.' On his part the publican, standing afar off, durst not even lift up his eyes to heaven, but smote upon his breast, saying, 'O God, be merciful to me a sinner.' I tell you this man went down to his house justified, but not the other."[3]

A hatred which death alone could assuage was the consequence of these struggles. John the Baptist had before this called on himself hostility of the same sort.[4] The aristocrats of Jerusalem, who despised him, had

[1] Matt. xv. 2–14. Mark vii. 4, 8. Luke v. 33–39; vi. 1–11; xi. 37–44

[2] Luke xi. 41. [3] Luke xviii. 9–14: comp. xiv. 7–11.

[4] Matt. iii. 7–10; xvii. 12, 13.

allowed simple men to regard him as a prophet;[1] but in this case it was war to the death. A new spirit had appeared in the world, which shattered all that had preceded it. John the Baptist was a thorough Jew: Jesus was scarcely one at all. Jesus always addresses himself to refined moral sentiment. He is a disputant only when he argues against the Pharisees, opposition forcing him, as almost always happens, to adopt its tone.[2] His keen sarcasm, his stinging challenge, always struck to the heart. They remained in the wound, branded indelibly. That Nessus-shirt of ridicule which the Jew, son of the Pharisees, has dragged in tatters after him these eighteen centuries, was woven by Jesus with supreme skill. Masterpieces of fine raillery, his darts have left their fiery mark in the flesh of the hypocrite and the false devotee. Marvellous darts, fit to be shot by a son of God! Only a divine hand can kill by a touch like this! Socrates and Molière do but graze the skin; but he carries fire and wrath to the very marrow.

It was clear, however, that this great master of irony must pay for his triumph with his life. Even in Galilee the Pharisees sought to kill him, and employed against him the strategy which was later to succeed at Jerusalem. They endeavoured to interest in their quarrel the partisans of the new political order just established.[3] The facilities which Jesus found in Galilee for escape, and the weakness of the government of Antipas, baffled these attempts. He exposed himself to danger of his own free-will. He saw clearly that his action,

[1] Matt. xiv. 5; xxi. 26. Mark xi. 32. Luke xx. 6.
[2] Matt. xii. 3–8; xxiii. 16–33.
[3] Mark iii. 6.

if he continued shut up in Galilee, was necessarily cramped. Judæa attracted him as by a charm; he longed to put forth one last effort to gain over the rebellious city, as if it were his most imperative task to justify the proverb which says, "It cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem."[1]

[1] Luke xiii. 33.

CHAPTER XXI.

LAST JOURNEY TO JERUSALEM.

For a long time Jesus had been conscious of the dangers that surrounded him.[1] During a period which we may reckon at eighteen months, he avoided going on a pilgrimage to the holy city.[2] At the Feast of Tabernacles of the year 32 (according to the theory here adopted), his kindred, always malevolent and incredulous,[3] urged him to go thither. The evangelist seems to hint that in this very urgency there was some hidden project to ruin him. "Show yourself to the world," said they; "things like these are never done in secret. Go into Judæa, that people may see what you can do." Jesus, suspecting some treachery, at first refused; but when the caravan of pilgrims had set out, he started on the journey, unknown to every one, and almost alone.[4] It was the last farewell he bade to Galilee. The Feast of Tabernacles fell at the autumnal equinox. Six months had still to run before the fatal crisis; but during this interval Jesus did not again see his beloved provinces of the north. The pleasant days are passed; he must now traverse, step by step,

[1] Matt. xvi. 20, 21; Mark viii. 30, 31.
[2] John vii. 1.
[3] John vii. 5.
[4] John vii. 10.

the path of sorrows which will terminate in the anguish of death.

In Judæa Jesus was again met by his disciples and the pious women who ministered to him.[1] But how all else was changed for him! At Jerusalem he was a stranger, and felt that there was a wall of resistance he could not pierce. Surrounded by snares and obstacles, he was unceasingly pursued by the ill-will of the Pharisees.[2] In place of that illimitable faculty of belief, the happy gift of youthful natures, which he found in Galilee; instead of those kind-hearted and gentle people, among whom opposition (always the fruit of some slight ill-will or indocility) had no hold, — he encountered here at every step an obstinate unbelief, upon which the course that had succeeded so well in the north had little effect. His disciples were despised as being Galileans. Nicodemus, who on one of his former journeys had held an interview with Jesus by night, almost compromised himself with the Sanhedrim by seeking to defend him. "What! are you too a Galilean?" said they; "inquire [of the Scripture] and see, for no prophet can come out of Galilee."[3]

The city, as we have already said, was displeasing to Jesus. Until then he had always shunned great centres, choosing to pursue his work in the country or in towns of small importance. Many of the precepts he had given to his Apostles were absolutely inapplicable except among a simple society of humble men.[4] Having no idea of the world, and accustomed to the neighbourly communism of Galilee, he would sometimes

[1] Matt. xxvii. 55; Mark xv. 41; Luke xxiii. 49, 55.
[2] John vii. 20, 25, 30, 32.
[3] John vii. 50–52.
[4] Matt. x. 11–13; Mark vi. 10; Luke x. 5–8.

let fall expressions which at Jerusalem might sound rustic and odd.[1] His imagination and his love of Nature were straitened within these walls. The true religion was to come not from the tumult of the towns, but from the tranquil serenity of fields. Then, too, priestly arrogance always made the precincts of the Temple disagreeable to him. One day some of his disciples, who were better acquainted with Jerusalem than he, wished to draw his attention to the beauty of the buildings of the Temple, the admirable choice of materials, and the wealth of votive offerings that covered the walls. "You see all these buildings," said he; "but I tell you there shall not be left one stone upon another!"[2] He refused to admire anything, unless it was a poor widow who was just then passing, and threw a farthing into the box. "She has cast in more than they all," said he; "for the rest have given of their abundance, but she gave all she had."[3] This manner of looking captiously at everything done at Jerusalem; of extolling the poor who gave little, and slighting the rich who gave much;[4] and of blaming the opulent clergy who did nothing for the good of the people, — naturally exasperated the priestly caste. The Temple, like the Mussulman *haram* that has taken its place, was the seat of a conservative aristocracy, — the last place in the world where revolution could succeed. Imagine an innovator going, now-a-days, to preach the overthrow of Islam about the

[1] Matt. xvi. 3. Mark xi. 3; xiv. 13, 14. Luke xix. 31; xxii. 10–12.

[2] Matt. xxiv. 1, 2; Mark xiii. 1, 2; Luke xix. 44 and xxi. 5, 6 (compare Mark vi. 11).

[3] Mark xii. 41–44; Luke xxi. 1–4.

[4] Mark xii. 41.

mosque of Omar! Here, however, was the centre of the Jewish life, the point where it was needful to conquer or die. In this torturing arena, where Jesus certainly suffered more than at Golgotha, his days passed in disputation and bitterness, amidst tedious controversies of canon law and exegesis, for which his great moral elevation served him to little purpose, — nay, placed him rather at a disadvantage.

In the midst of this troubled life, the sensitive and kindly heart of Jesus succeeded in creating a refuge, where he enjoyed much soft content. When the day had been spent with disputing in the Temple, he would go down towards evening into the valley of the Kedron and take a little repose in the orchard of a farming establishment — probably an olive-orchard for the making of oil — named *Gethsemane*[1] (which was used as a pleasure-resort by the inhabitants), and then go to pass the night upon the Mount of Olives, which bounds the prospect from the city on the east.[2] This side is the only one near Jerusalem which presents an aspect somewhat smiling and verdant. The plantations of olives, figs, and palms were numerous about the villages, farms, or enclosures of Bethphage, Gethsemane, and Bethany.[3] There were upon the Mount of Olives two great cedars, the recollection of which was long preserved among the dispersed Jews; their branches served as an asylum to clouds of doves, and under

[1] Mark xi. 19; Luke xxii. 39; John xviii. 1, 2. This cannot be far from a spot where Catholic piety has enclosed a few old olive-trees by a wall. The word "Gethsemane" apparently signifies "oil-press."

[2] Luke xxi. 37 and xxii. 39; John viii. 1, 2.

[3] This we may infer from the meaning of the names [Beth-phage, "place of figs;" Bethany, "of dates," and Gethsemane], though they may be interpreted differently: see Babylonian Talmud, *Pesachim*, 53 *a*.

their shade were little shops.[1] All this precinct was in a manner the abode of Jesus and his disciples; we can see that they knew it, almost field by field and house by house.

The village of Bethany, in particular,[2] situated at the summit of the hill, upon the incline which looks out on the Dead Sea and the Jordan, at a walk of an hour and a half from Jerusalem, was the place preferred by Jesus.[3] There he made the acquaintance of a family consisting of three persons, two sisters and a brother, whose friendship had a great charm for him.[4] Of the two sisters, one, named Martha, was an obliging, kind-hearted, and busy person;[5] while the other, named Mary, pleased Jesus by a certain placidity of temperament[6] and a keen, cultivated, inquiring mind. Often, when seated at the feet of Jesus, she forgot, in listening to him, the duties of real life. Her sister, upon whom fell all the care, would then mildly complain. "Martha, Martha," said Jesus to her, "you vex yourself with care about too many things; but only one thing is needful, and Mary has chosen the better part, which will not be taken away from her."[7] A certain Simon, a leper (the owner of the house), appears to have been the brother of Martha and Mary,[8]

[1] Jerusalem Talmud, *Taanith*, iv. 8.

[2] Now *El-azirieh*, from *El-Azir*, Arabic for Lazarus: mediæval, *Lazarium*.

[3] Matt. xxi. 17, 18; Mark xi. 11, 12. [4] John xi. 5, 35, 36.

[5] Luke x. 38–42; John xii. 2. Luke seems to put the dwelling on the road from Galilee to Jerusalem; but the locality here indicated (chap ix. 51 to xviii. 31) is unintelligible if taken literally. Sundry incidents of this portion of the narrative seem to have occurred at or near Jerusalem.

[6] John xi. 20. [7] Luke x. 38–42.

[8] Matt. xxvi. 6; Mark xiv. 3; Luke vii. 40, 43; John xi. 1–46 and xii. 1–3. The name Lazarus, given to the brother of Mary and Martha

or, at least, to have formed part of the family. Here, in the bosom of a pious friendship, Jesus forgot the vexations of public life. In this tranquil abode he consoled himself for the bickerings with which the Pharisees and the Scribes continually troubled him. He would sit on the Mount of Olives, facing Mount Moriah,[1] having before his eyes the splendid prospect of the terraces of the Temple, and its roofs covered with glittering plates of metal. This view struck strangers with admiration: at sunrise, especially, the sacred mountain dazzled the eyes, and appeared like a mass of snow flecked with gold.[2] But a profound feeling of sadness poisoned for Jesus the spectacle that filled all other Israelites with joy and pride. "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest those who are sent to thee! how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and thou wouldest not!"[3]

It was not that many good people here, as in Galilee, were not touched; but such was the weight of the dominant orthodoxy that very few dared to confess it. They feared discredit with the public at Jerusalem by confessing themselves pupils of a Galilean; for they would have risked being driven from the synagogue,

in the Fourth Gospel, seems to come from the parable in Luke xvi. 19–31 (note especially verses 30, 31). The epithet "leper" given to Simon, corresponding with the phrase "full of sores" (Luke xvi. 20), may have led to the curious grouping in the Fourth Gospel; while the awkward explanation given in John xi. 1, 2, shows clearly that Lazarus is a less substantial person in the tradition than the two sisters.

[1] Mark xiii. 3.

[2] Josephus, *Wars*, V. v. 6.

[3] Matt. xxiii. 37; Luke xiii. 34. These words, like those in Matt. xxiii. 34, 35, seem to be a quotation from some apocryphal prophecy, perhaps Enoch. (See the passages given in the Introduction, pp. 41, 42, and near the close of this chapter, p. 340, note 4.)

which, in a mean and bigoted society, was the last indignity,[1] and, besides, excommunication carried with it the confiscation of all possessions.[2] In ceasing to be a Jew, a man did not become a Roman; he remained without protection under the scourge of a theocratic legislation of the most atrocious severity. One day certain inferior officers of the Temple, who had listened to one of the discourses of Jesus and had been enchanted with it, came to confide their doubts to the priests: "Have any of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed on him?" was the reply to them; "but all this crowd who know nothing of the Law are a cursed mob."[3] Jesus remained thus at Jerusalem a provincial, admired by provincials like himself, but spurned by all the aristocracy of the nation. Heads of schools were too numerous for any one to be much stirred by seeing one more appear. His voice made little noise in Jerusalem. Prejudices of race and of sect, directly antagonistic to the spirit of the gospel, were too deeply rooted there.

The teaching of Jesus in this new field was necessarily much altered. The charm of his discourse, whose effect was always sure upon the youthful imagination and a conscience morally pure, here fell upon stone. He who was so much at his ease on the shores of his beautiful little lake felt constrained and out of place in the company of pedants. His perpetual self-assertion sounds at times almost disdainful.[4] He must become by turns a controversialist, jurist, commentator, and theologian. His conversations, generally so gracious in tone,

[1] John vii. 13; xii. 42, 43; xix. 38.

[2] Ezra x. 8; Heb. x. 34; Jerusalem Talmud, *Moëd katon*, iii. 1.

[3] John vii. 45–52 [*une canaille maudite*].

[4] John viii. 13–18.

now become a rolling fire of disputes,[1] an interminable train of scholastic battles. His harmonious genius is diluted in insipid argumentations upon the Law and the Prophets,[2] in which we should like it better if we did not see him sometimes play the part of assailant.[3] He submits, with a condescension that offends us, to the captious questioning which vulgar tricksters compel him to undergo.[4] In general, he extricated himself from the snarl with ample skill. His reasonings, it is true, were often subtile, for simplicity of mind and subtilty touch each other: when simplicity reasons, it is always a little sophistical. We may find him sometimes courting misconceptions, even prolonging them intentionally;[5] and his argument, judged by the rules of Aristotelian logic, is very weak. But when the unequalled charm of his mind chanced to betray itself, he was triumphant. One day it was intended to embarrass him by bringing to him an adulteress and asking him what was to be done to her. His admirable answer is well known.[6] The polished sarcasm of a man of the world, tempered by a divine tenderness, could not be expressed with finer skill. But the intelligence which is allied to moral grandeur is that which fools are last to forgive. In pronouncing this sentence

[1] Matt. xxi. 23–27.

[2] Matt. xxii. 23-33.

[3] Ibid. xxii. 41–45.

[4] Ibid. xxii. 36–40, 46.

[5] See especially the discussions reported in the Fourth Gospel, — chap. viii. Such passages, we hasten to add, have no other value than as very ancient conjectures regarding his life.

[6] John viii. 3–11. This passage did not make part of the original Gospel; it is wanting in the oldest MSS., and the reading is uncertain. Still, it is a very early gospel tradition, as shown in verses 6, 8, which are not in the manner of Luke and later compilers, who insert only what explains itself. The incident seems to have been known to Papias, and was in the Gospel of the Hebrews: see Euseb. *Hist.* iii. 39; and Appendix, *post.*

so just and so austere, — "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her," — Jesus pierced hypocrisy to the heart, and with the same stroke signed his own death-sentence.

It is probable, in fact, that but for the exasperation caused by so many bitter retorts, Jesus might long have remained unnoticed, and have been lost in the dreadful storm which was soon about to overwhelm the whole Jewish nation. The high-priesthood and the Sadducees felt towards him rather disdain than hate. The great sacerdotal families — the *Boëthusim*, the family of Hanan — were fanatics only in defending their own security. The Sadducees, like Jesus, rejected the "traditions" of the Pharisees.[1] By a very strange singularity, it was these sceptics who, denying the resurrection, the unwritten Law, and the existence of angels, were the true Jews; or rather, as the old Law in its simplicity no longer satisfied the religious wants of the time, those who strictly adhered to it and rejected modern inventions were regarded by the devotees as impious, — very much as an evangelical Protestant of the present day is regarded as an unbeliever in orthodox countries. At all events, from such a party no very strong reaction against Jesus could proceed. The official priesthood, with its eyes turned toward political power and intimately in league with it, did not comprehend these outbursts of enthusiasm. It was the middle-class Pharisees, the innumerable *soferim*, or scribes, living on the science of "traditions," who took the alarm, whose prejudices and interests were in reality threatened by the doctrine of the new teacher.

One of the most constant efforts of the Pharisees was

[1] Josephus, *Antiq.* xii. x. 6; xviii. i. 4.

to draw Jesus into the discussion of political questions, and to implicate him with the party of Judas the Gaulonite. The device was clever; for it required great ingenuity in Jesus to avoid conflict with the Roman authority while he was proclaiming the kingdom of God. The Pharisees sought to break through this ambiguity, and compel him to explain himself. One day, a group of them, and of those politicians named "Herodians" (probably some of the *Boëthusim*), approached him, and, under pretence of pious zeal, said to him, "Master, we know that thou art true, and teachest the way of God in truth, caring naught for any man. Tell us, therefore, what thou thinkest: Is it lawful to give tribute to Cæsar, or not?" They hoped for an answer which would give them a pretext for delivering him up to Pilate. The reply of Jesus was admirable. He made them show him the image on the *denarius*. "Render," said he, "to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's; and to God the things that are God's."[1] A deep saying, which has decided the future

[1] Matt. xxii. 15–22; Mark. xii. 13–17; Luke xx. 20–26: comp. Jerusalem Talmud, *Sanhedrin*, ii. 3; Rom. xiii. 6, 7. It may be doubted whether the incident is literally true. The coins of Herod, Archelaus, and Antipas (before the reign of Caligula) have not the emperor's name or head. Those struck at Jerusalem under the procurators have his name, but not his image (Eckhel, *Doctr.* iii. 497, 498). The coins of Philip have the emperor's name and head (Lévy, *Gesch. der jüd. Münzen*, 67; Madden, *Hist. of Jewish Coinage*, p. 80). But these coins, struck at Paneas, are all pagan; besides, they were not the proper coinage of Jerusalem: founded, therefore, on them, the argument of Jesus has no support. To suppose that he made his reply in view of coins struck outside of Palestine, with the effigy of Tiberius (*Revue numism.* 1860, p. 159), is unlikely. It would seem that the fine Christian aphorism has been antedated. The idea that the effigy on coins is a mark of sovereignty is found, further, in the care taken (at least under the second revolt) to restamp the Roman money, marking it with Jewish images (Lévy, p. 104 *et seq.*; Madden, pp. 176, 203).

of Christianity! a motto of perfect spirituality and of marvellous precision, which has laid the foundation of spiritual as distinct from temporal power, thus making firm the base of true liberalism and true civilisation!

The gentle and penetrating genius of Jesus inspired him, when he was alone with his disciples, with accents full of tenderness: —

He that enters not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbs up some other way, is a thief and a robber; but he that enters by the door is the shepherd of the sheep. The sheep hear his voice; and he calls his own sheep by name, and leads them out to pasture. He goes before them, and the sheep follow him; for they know his voice. The thief comes only to steal and kill and destroy. A hireling, not the shepherd, who does not own the sheep, sees the wolf coming, and leaves the sheep, and flees away. I am the good shepherd, and know my sheep, and they know me; and I lay down my life for them.[1]

The idea that the crisis of humanity was close at hand frequently recurs in his discourse: —

Now [said he] learn a parable of the fig-tree: When the branch is yet tender, and puts forth leaves, you know that summer is nigh. Lift up your eyes, and look on the fields; for they are white already to harvest.[2]

His powerful eloquence found fresh expression whenever contending with hypocrisy: — .

The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat. Do, therefore, whatever they bid you do, but not what they do themselves; for they say and do not. For they bind heavy burdens impossible to carry, and lay them on men's shoulders; but they themselves will not move them with the tip of their fingers.

[1] John x. 1–16,— a passage confirmed by the Clementine homilies, iii. 52.
[2] Matt. xxiv. 32; Mark. xiii. 28; Luke xxi. 30; John iv. 35.

They do all their works to be seen by men: they walk in long robes; they wear broad phylacteries,[1] and have wide borders to their garments,[2] and choose the highest places at feasts and the chief seats in the synagogues; they love greetings in the streets, and to be called Master, Master. Woe unto them! . . .

Woe to you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! who have taken away the key of knowledge, using it only to shut up the kingdom of heaven against men! You neither go in yourselves, nor suffer those that are entering to go in.[3] Woe to you, devourers of widows' houses, who for a pretence make long prayers: your condemnation will be the greater. Woe to you, who compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made, make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves! Woe to you, for you are like graves which appear not; and the men who walk over them are not aware of them.[4]

Fools and blind! who pay tithe of mint, anise, and cumin, and neglect the weightier matters of the Law, — judgment, mercy, and good-faith: these last should be observed, not leaving the other undone. Blind guides, who strain a gnat from your wine, and swallow a camel! Woe to you!

Woe to you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! who make clean the outside of the cup and platter,[5] but within they are

[1] *Tolafôth*, or *tefillin*, — strips of metal or parchment containing passages of the Law, worn by devout Jews on the brow or left arm, so as to obey literally the injunctions of Exodus xiii. 9; Deut. vi. 8 and xi. 18.

[2] *Zizith*, — red borders or fringes, worn by Jews at the edge of the cloak as a mark of distinction from Pagans (Num. xv. 38, 39; Deut. xxii. 12).

[3] Excluding men from the kingdom of God by petty casuistry, which makes admission difficult and deters the simple.

[4] To touch a grave made one "unclean;" hence the boundary was carefully marked on the ground (Babylonian Talmud, *Baba bathra*, 58 *a*; *Baba metsia*, 45 *b*). The reproach here addressed to the Pharisees is of having devised a multitude of petty precepts which might be violated ignorantly, serving only to multiply legal technicalities.

[5] For this the rules were extremely intricate: see Mark vii. 4.

full of extortion and excess. Thou blind Pharisee,[1] cleanse first that which is within, and then look to cleansing the outside![2]

Woe to you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! who are like whited sepulchres,[3] which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones and of all uncleanness. Even so ye outwardly appear righteous, but within are full of hypocrisy and iniquity.

Woe to you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! who build the tombs of the prophets and garnish the sepulchres of the righteous, and say, 'If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have shared with them in the blood of the prophets.' But by your own confession you are the children of those who killed the prophets. Fill up then the measure of your fathers! Well said the Wisdom of God:[4] 'I will send unto you prophets and wise men and scribes; and some of them ye shall kill and crucify; and some of them shall ye scourge in your synagogues, and persecute them from city to city; That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, son of Barachias, whom ye slew between

[1] This epithet "blind," so often repeated (Matt. xxiii. 16, 17, 19, 24, 26), very likely refers to the Pharisaic habit of walking with the eyes closed, in affectation of piety (see *ante*, p. 322).

[2] According to Luke xi. 37–41, this was spoken at a repast, in answer to certain vain scruples of the Pharisees.

[3] As tombs were legally "unclean," it was customary to whitewash them, to warn against approaching them. See p. 339, note 4; also Mishna, *Maasar scheni*, v. 1; Jerusalem Talmud, *Schekalim*, i. 1; *Maasar scheni*, v. 1; *Moëd katon*, i. 2; *Sota*, ix. 1; Babylonian Talmud, *Moëd katon*, 5 *a*. Perhaps there is here an allusion to the "painted Pharisees" (see *ante*, p. 322).

[4] This passage seems to be from the Book of Enoch. Parts of the revelations ascribed to this patriarch were put in the mouth of the Divine Wisdom: comp. Enoch xxxvii. 1-4; xlviii. 1, 7; xlix. 1; also Book of Jubilees, chap. 7, with Luke xi. 49 (See Introduction, p. 42, note 1). This apocrypha was possibly of Christian origin (See Matt. xxiii. 34, where some points were doubtless added after the death of Jesus). The citation may be a relatively late addition; it is wanting in Mark.

the temple and the altar.'[1] I tell you that all this blood will be required of this generation.[2]

The terrible dogma of the substitution of the Gentiles — the idea that the kingdom of God was to be transferred to others, because those for whom it was destined would not receive it[3] — recurs as a bloody menace against the aristocracy; and the title "Son of God," which Jesus openly assumed in striking parables[4] where his enemies appear as murderers of the heavenly messengers, was an open defiance to legal Judaism. The bold appeal addressed to the poor was still more seditious. He declared that he had "come that the blind might see, and that they who see might be made blind."[5] One day his dislike of the Temple forced from him an imprudent speech:[6] "I might, if I would, destroy this Temple made with hands, and within three days build another made without men's hands." We do not know clearly what meaning he attached to this phrase, in which his disciples sought for some forced allegory. But as only a pretext was wanted, it was quickly laid hold of. It appeared in the preamble of his death-warrant, and rang in his ears amidst the

[1] There is a confusion here, found also in the Targum of Jonathan (Lam. ii. 20), between Zachariah son of Jehoiada and Zachariah the prophet, son of Barachiah. The reference is to the former (2 Chron. xxiv. 21). With Chronicles, in which the murder of Zachariah is related, the Hebrew canon ends. This murder is the last in the list of murders of holy men, set forth in the order in which they occur in the Bible, — Abel being first.

[2] Matt. xxiii. 2–36; Mark xii. 38–40; Luke xi. 39–52 and xx. 46, 47.

[3] Matt. viii. 11, 12; xx. 1–16; xxi. 28–32, 33–41, 43; xxii. 1–14. Mark xii. 1–11. Luke xx. 9–16.

[4] Matt. xxi. 37–41; Mark xii. 6; Luke xx. 9; John x. 33–38.

[5] John ix. 39.

[6] The most authentic form seems to be that in Mark xiv. 58; xv. 29; comp. John ii. 19; Matt. xxvi. 61 and xxvii. 40; Acts vi. 13, 14.

last agonies of Calvary. These irritating discussions always ended in tumult. The Pharisees threw stones at him;[1] in doing which they only fulfilled an article of the Law, commanding that every prophet, even a worker of miracles, who should turn the people from the ancient worship, be stoned without a hearing.[2] At other times they called him mad, possessed, Samaritan,[3] or even sought to kill him.[4] His words were taken note of in order to invoke against him the laws of an intolerant theocracy, which the Roman government had not yet swept aside.[5]

[1] John viii. 39; x. 31; xi. 8.
[2] Deut. xiii. 1–10: comp. Luke xx. 6; John x. 33; 2 Cor. xi. 25.
[3] John x. 20. [4] Ibid. v. 18; vii. 1, 20, 25, 30; viii. 37, 40.
[5] Luke xi. 53, 54.

CHAPTER XXII.

HOSTILE MACHINATIONS.

Jesus passed the autumn and a part of the winter at Jerusalem. This season is there rather cold.[1] Solomon's Porch, with its covered cloisters, was the place where he habitually walked.[2] This porch, the only remaining portion of the ancient Temple, consisted of two arcades, formed by two rows of columns and the wall overlooking the valley of Kedron.[3] Communication with the country outside was by way of the Susa gate, the piers of which may yet be seen just within what is now called "the golden gate."[4] The other side of the valley was already decorated with sumptuous tombs. Some of the monuments, which may still be seen there, were perhaps those cenotaphs in honour of ancient prophets[5] which Jesus had in mind, when, seated under the portico, he denounced the official

[1] Jerusalem is something over 2500 feet above the sea-level, according to Vignes (*Conn. des Temps*, 1886); or 2440, according to Captain Wilson (*Le Lien*, Aug. 4, 1886). [The altitude ranges from 2000 feet in the valley of Kedron to 2610 at the northwest corner of the city (McClintock and Strong).]

[2] John x. 23. See Vogüé's restoration in *Le Temple*, etc. pl. xv. xvi. pp. 12, 22, 50. [See the description in "History of Israel," v. 245–250.]

[3] Josephus, *Antiq.* XX. ix. 7; *Wars*, V. v. 2.

[4] Apparently, of the time of Justinian.

[5] See *ante*, p. 340. The so-called "tomb of Zecharia" was perhaps such a monument: compare *Itin. a Burdig. Hierus.*, p. 153 (ed. Schott).

classes who covered their hypocrisy or their vanity by these colossal piles.[1]

At the end of December he celebrated at Jerusalem the feast established by Judas the Maccabee, in memory of the purification of the Temple after the sacrileges of Antiochus Epiphanes.[2] It was called the "Feast of Lights," because, during the eight days of the festival, lamps were kept lighted in the houses.[3] Jesus soon after took a journey into Peræa and along the banks of the Jordan, — that is to say, into the same country he had visited some years previously, when he followed the school of John,[4] and where he himself had administered baptism. Here he seems to have enjoyed some solace, especially at Jericho. This city, either as an important centre of travel, or on account of its gardens of spices and its rich cultivation, contained a customs station of some consequence.[5] The chief collector, Zacchæus, a rich man, desired to see Jesus.[6] As he was "little of stature," he mounted a sycamore-tree near the road where the company had to pass. Jesus was touched with this trait of simplicity in a man of importance, and, at the risk of scandal, he went to the house of Zacchæus. There was much murmuring at his thus honouring the house of a "sinner" by a visit.

[1] Matt. xxiii. 29; Luke xi. 47.

[2] John x. 22: comp. 1 Macc. iv. 45–54; 2 Macc. x. 6–8.

[3] Josephus, *Antiq.* XII. vii. 7.

[4] John x. 40: comp. Matt. xix. 1 and xx. 29; Mark x. 1, 46; Luke xviii. 35 and xix. 1. This journey is known to the Synoptics, but by Matt. and Mark is referred to the advance from Galilee by way of Peræa. The topography of Luke is unintelligible unless we suppose chapters x.–xviii. refer to incidents in the near vicinity of Jerusalem.

[5] Eccles. xxiv. 18; Strabo, XVI. ii. 41; Justin, xxxvi. 3; Josephus, *Antiq.* IV. vi. 1, XIV. iv. 1, and XV. iv. 2; Babyl. Talmud, *Berakoth*, 43 *a*.

[6] Luke xix. 1–10 (a dubious episode).

In parting, Jesus pronounced his host a good son of Abraham; and, as if to add to the vexation of the orthodox, Zacchæus became a saint: he gave, it is said, half of his goods to the poor, and restored fourfold to those whom he might have wronged. This was not the only pleasure which Jesus experienced there. On leaving the town, the beggar Bartimæus[1] pleased him much by persistently calling him "Son of David," although he was bidden to be silent. The cycle of Galilean miracles appeared for a time to revive in this country, which in many respects was like the northern provinces. The delightful oasis of Jericho, at that time well watered, must have been one of the most beautiful spots in Syria. Josephus speaks of it with the same admiration as of Galilee, and calls it, like that province, "a heavenly country."[2]

After Jesus had completed what we may call a pilgrimage among the scenes of his earliest prophetic activity, he returned to his beloved abode at Bethany.[3] What most pained the faithful Galileans at Jerusalem was that no miracles were ever wrought there. Weary of the cold reception which the kingdom of God found in the capital, the friends of Jesus wished, it seems, for some great miracle that should strike powerfully the Jerusalemite unbelief. A resurrection doubtless appeared to them the most convincing thing in the world. We may suppose that Martha and Mary had expressed themselves to Jesus on the subject. Rumour already accredited to him two or three instances of this class.[4] "If some one

[1] Matt. xx. 29; Mark x. 46–52; Luke xviii. 35.

[2] Josephus, *Wars*, IV. viii. 3: comp. *ibid.* I. vi. 6 and xviii. 5; *Antiq* XV. iv. 2.

[3] John xi. 1.

[4] Matt. ix. 18, 19, 22–26; Mark v. 22–24, 35–43; Luke vii. 11–17, and viii. 41, 42, 49–56.

should be raised from the dead, perhaps the living would repent," was no doubt the remark made by the pious sisters. "No," he might reply; "even though one rose from the dead, they would not be persuaded;"[1] then, recalling a story familiar to him, — that of the pious beggar, covered with sores, who died and was carried by angels to Abraham's bosom,[2]—"Even should Lazarus return," he may have added, "they would not believe." Later on, a curious misunderstanding arose about it. The hypothesis became a fact. Lazarus was spoken of as if he had really risen from the dead, with censures of the unpardonable obstinacy that could resist such testimony. The "sores" of Lazarus and the "leprosy" of Simon the leper were confounded;[3] and it was adopted as a part of the tradition that Mary and Martha had a brother named Lazarus,[4] whom Jesus had raised from the dead.[5] When we know out of what inaccuracies, what incoherent fables, the gossip of an Eastern city is made up, we cannot regard it as

[1] Luke xvi. 30, 31.

[2] Quite probably, the allegorical person here called "Lazarus" (אלעזר "whom God helps," or לא-עזר, "who has no help"), indicating the people of Israel, — "the poor man" beloved of God, a phrase familiar both to prophet and psalmist [see, respecting the *Anavim*, "History of the People of Israel," iv. 26], — had been consecrated, before the time of Jesus, by some popular legend, or in some book now lost.

[3] It may be noted how forced and unnatural is the juncture of the verse Luke xvi. 23, where we seem to find one of those fusions of alien elements common in Luke. (See Introduction, p. 64.)

[4] Observe the curious juxtaposition in John xi. 1, 2: Lazarus is first introduced as an unknown person, — τὶς ἀσθενῶν Λάζαρος, "one Lazarus, a sick man," — and is directly after found to be a brother of Mary and Martha.

[5] I have no doubt that John xi. 1–16 is parallel with Luke xiv. 19–31: not that the fourth evangelist had the text of Luke before his eyes, but both are derived, doubtless, from kindred traditions. See Appendix, *passim*.

impossible that a rumour of this kind was spread abroad at Jerusalem in the lifetime of Jesus, and had for him such fatal consequences.

Certain noticeable hints, in fact, seem to show that some motive proceeding from Bethany helped to hasten the death of Jesus.[1] At times we are led to infer that the family of Bethany were guilty of some indiscretion, or fell into an excess of zeal. Possibly, their ardent wish to stop the mouth of those who offensively denied the divine mission of their friend carried these impulsive persons beyond all bounds. It must be remembered that in this dissolute and dull-witted city of Jerusalem Jesus was not quite himself. His conscience, through the fault of others and not his own, was not quite so simply transparent as at first. Deprived of hope, and pushed (as it were) to the wall, he was no longer master of himself. His mission swept him on, and he yielded to the torrent. Death would in a few days restore him his divine liberty, and wrench him away from the fatal necessities of a position which with every hour became more exacting and more difficult to sustain.

The contrast between his ever-increasing exaltation and the indifference of the Jews grew continually sharper. The public authorities at the same time were getting embittered against him. In the course of February, or early in March, a council was called by the chief priests,[2] and here the question was squarely put: "Can Jesus and Judaism exist together?" To raise the question was to settle it; and without being a prophet, as the evangelist holds, the high-priest might well announce his cruel maxim,

[1] John xi. 46–53; xii. 2, 9, 10, 17–19. [2] John x. 47–53.

"It is expedient that one man should die for the entire people."

"The high-priest of that year" — to use an expression of the Fourth Gospel, which clearly shows the state of abasement to which the sovereign pontificate was reduced — was Joseph Kaïapha (Caiaphas), appointed by Valerius Gratus, and entirely devoted to the Romans. Ever since Jerusalem had been under procurators, the office of high-priest had been changeable at pleasure; removal followed removal almost every year.[1] Caiaphas, however, held it longer than any one else. He had assumed his charge in the year 25 A. D., and he did not lose it till eleven years after. We know nothing of his character: many circumstances lead us to think that his power was only nominal. Beside and above him we always find another personage, who at the critical moment we have now reached appears to have exercised a preponderating power.

This personage was Hanan, or Annas,[2] son of Seth, and father-in-law of Caiaphas, an old deposed high-priest, who substantially preserved all the authority amid the numerous changes of the pontificate. Hanan had received the high-priesthood from the legate Quirinius, in the year 7 A. D. He lost his position in the year 14, on the accession of Tiberius; but he continued to be much respected. He was still called "high-priest," although he was out of office,[3] and was consulted upon all important matters. During fifty years the pontificate continued in his family almost without

[1] Josephus, *Antiq.* XV. iii. 1; XVIII. ii. 2 and v. 3; XX. ix. 1, 4. Jerusalem Talmud, *Joma*, i. 1; Babylonian Talmud, *Joma*, 47 *a*.

[2] The *Ananus* of Josephus: so the Hebrew *Johanan* became in Greek Joannes, or Joannas.

[3] John xviii. 15–23; Acts iv. 6.

interruption; five of his sons successively sustained this dignity,[1] without counting Caiaphas, who was his son-in-law. His was called the "priestly family," as if the priesthood had become hereditary in it.[2] Nearly all the chief offices of the Temple devolved upon them.[3] Another family, that of Boëthus, alternated, it is true, with that of Hanan in the pontificate.[4] But the *Boëthusim*, whose fortunes were of no very honourable origin, were much less esteemed by the pious middle class. Hanan was, then, in reality the chief of the sacerdotal party. Caiaphas did nothing without him: it was the custom to associate their names, and Hanan's was always put first.[5] It will be understood, in fact, that under this *régime* of an annual pontificate, changed according to the caprice of the procurators, an aged pontiff who had preserved the secret of the traditions, who had seen many a career younger than his own follow in quick succession, and who had retained sufficient influence to get the office delegated to persons who were in family rank his inferiors, must be a very important personage. Like all the aristocracy of the Temple,[6] he was a Sadducee, — "a sect," says Josephus, "particularly severe in its judgments."[7] All his sons were, moreover, violent persecutors. One of them, named Hanan like his father, caused James, "the Lord's brother," to be stoned, under circumstances not

[1] Josephus, *Antiq.* XX. ix. 1: comp. Jerusalem Talmud, *Horayoth*, iii. 5; Tosiphta, *Menachoth*, ii.

[2] Josephus, *Antiq.* XV. iii. 1; *Wars*, IV. v. 6, 7. Acts iv. 6.

[3] Josephus, *Antiq.* XX. ix. 3; Babylonian Talmud, *Pesachim*, 57 *a*.

[4] Josephus, *Antiq.* XV. ix. 3; XIX. vi. 2 and viii. 1.

[5] Luke iii. 2.

[6] Acts v. 17.

[7] Josephus, *Antiq.* XX. ix. 1: comp. *Megillath Taanith*, chap. iv. with schol.; Tosiphta, *Menachoth*, ii.

very unlike those connected with the death of Jesus.[1] The temper of the family was haughty, bold, and cruel;[2] it had that particular kind of proud and sullen malevolence which characterises Jewish policy. Thus, upon Hanan and his family must rest the responsibility of all the acts which followed. It was Hanan — or, if you like, the party he represented — who killed Jesus. Hanan was the principal actor in the terrible drama, and far more than Caiaphas, far more than Pilate, should have borne the weight of the maledictions of mankind.

It is in the mouth of Caiaphas that the evangelist puts the decisive words which led to the sentence of death being passed on Jesus.[3] It was supposed that the high-priest possessed a certain gift of prophecy; his words thus became an oracle full of profound meaning to the Christian community. But the phrase itself, whoever may have spoken it, expressed the feeling of the whole sacerdotal party. This party was strongly hostile to popular seditions. It sought to put a check upon religious enthusiasts, rightly foreseeing that by their excited preachings they would lead to the total ruin of the nation. Although the excitement created by Jesus had nothing temporal about it, the priests saw, as a final consequence of this agitation, an added weight in the Roman yoke, and also the overthrow of the Temple, the source of their riches and honours.[4]

Doubtless the causes which were to bring about the ruin of Jerusalem, thirty-seven years after, did not pro-

[1] Josephus, *Antiq.* XX. ix. 1 (there is no good reason to doubt the authority).

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] John xi. 49, 50: comp. xviii. 14.

[4] John xi. 48.

ceed from infant Christianity ; still, we cannot say that the motive alleged at this crisis by the priests was so ungrounded that we must perforce regard it as insincere. In a general sense, if Jesus were to succeed, he would really effect the ruin of the Jewish nation. Going on the ground universally admitted by all ancient polity, Hanan and Caiaphas were right in saying, " Better the death of one man than the ruin of a people!" As we hold, this reasoning is detestable; but it has been that of conservative parties from the very birth of human society. The " party of order" (I use this expression in its mean and narrow sense) has ever been the same. Deeming it the final aim of government to suppress popular excitement, it performs in its own eyes an act of patriotic duty when it prevents, by judicial murder, the tumultuous effusion of blood. Having little thought of the future, it does not dream that by declaring war against all innovation it runs the risk of crushing ideas destined one day to triumph. The death of Jesus was one of the thousand illustrations of this policy. The movement he directed was entirely spiritual, but it was still a movement: henceforth the men of order, persuaded that the essential thing for humanity is quiet, must prevent the new spirit from spreading abroad. Never was it seen by a more striking example how such conduct defeats its own end. Left alone, Jesus would have exhausted himself in a hopeless struggle with the impossible. The unintelligent hate of his enemies determined the success of his work, and set the seal to his divinity.

The death of Jesus was thus resolved upon in the month of February or March.[1] But he escaped yet

[1] John xi. 53.

for some little time. He withdrew to a town called Ephraim (or Ephron), in the direction of Bethel, a short day's journey from Jerusalem, on the border of the desert.[1] He spent a few days there with his disciples, allowing the storm to pass over. But the order to arrest him as soon as he appeared at Jerusalem was given out. The solemnity of the Passover was drawing near, and it was thought that Jesus, according to his custom, would come to celebrate it at Jerusalem.[2]

[1] John xi. 54: comp. 2 Chron. xiii. 19; Josephus, *Wars*, XV. ix. 9; Eusebius and Jerome, *De situ et nomin. loc. hebræ.*, at the words Ἐφρών and Ἐφραΐμ. It is generally identified with *Tayyibeh*.

[2] John xi. 55, 56. In the order of events throughout this portion, we follow the scheme of John. The Synoptics seem ill-informed as to the period of time immediately preceding the crucifixion.

CHAPTER XXIII.

THE LAST WEEK.

Jesus, with his disciples, set out accordingly to revisit the unbelieving city for the last time. The hopes of his followers were more and more exalted. All believed, as they went up to Jerusalem, that the kingdom of God was about to be declared.[1] The impiety of men was at its height, and this was a great sign that the consummation was near. The belief in this was such that they already disputed for precedence in the kingdom.[2] This was, it is said, the moment chosen by Salome to demand on behalf of her sons the two seats on the right and left of the Son of Man.[3] The Master, for his part, was beset by grave thoughts. At times he allowed a gloomy resentment against his enemies to appear. He related the parable of a nobleman, who goes to take possession of a kingdom in a far country; but hardly has he set out when his fellow-citizens wish to rid themselves of him. The king returns, and commands that those who have conspired against him should be brought before him, and he puts them all to death.[4] At other times he peremptorily destroyed the illusions of the disciples. As they walked along the stony roads to the north of Jerusalem, Jesus went in advance, lost

[1] Luke xix. 11.
[2] Luke xxii. 24–26.
[3] Matt. xx. 20–23; Mark x. 35–40.
[4] Luke xix. 12–27.

in thought. They all gazed at him in silence, with a feeling of dread, not daring to question him. He had already spoken to them at various times of his future sufferings, and they had listened reluctantly.[1] Jesus at length spoke out, and, no longer concealing his presentiments, addressed them on his approaching end.[2] This caused great sadness in the whole company; for the disciples were expecting soon to see the sign appear in the clouds. The inaugural cry of the kingdom of God, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord,"[3] resounded already in joyous accents among the group, and the sanguinary prospect troubled them. At each step of the fatal road, the kingdom of God seemed nearer or more remote in the cloudland of their dreams. For himself, Jesus was confirmed in the thought that he was about to die, but that his death would save the world.[4] The misunderstanding between him and his disciples grew deeper every moment.

The custom was to reach Jerusalem several days before the Passover, in order to make preparation for it. Jesus was among the last to arrive, and at one moment his enemies thought themselves baulked of the hope they had formed of seizing him.[5] On the sixth day before the feast (Saturday, 8th of Nisan,[6] or 28th of March) he at length reached Bethany. According to his custom, he entered the house of Lazarus, Martha, and Mary,

[1] Matt. xvi. 21–23; Mark viii. 31–33.

[2] Matt. xx. 17–19; Mark. x. 32-34; Luke ix. 18–22, 31.

[3] Matt. xxiii. 39; Luke xiii. 35. [4] Matt. xx. 28.

[5] John xi. 56.

[6] The Passover was kept on the 14th of the month Nisan, which in the year 33 began on a Saturday, making the 14th fall on Friday; but the uncertainty of the Jewish calendar renders all calculation doubtful. See *Mem. de l'Acad. des Inscr.* etc. xxiii. pt. 2, p. 367 (new series).

or of Simon the leper, where he received a hospitable welcome. There was a dinner at Simon the leper's,[1] at which many persons assembled, attracted by the desire of seeing the new prophet, and also, it is said, of seeing Lazarus, of whom so many reports had lately gone about. Simon, who was seated at the table, passed already, perhaps, in the eyes of many as the man said to have risen from the dead, and attracted general attention. Martha served, as was her wont.[2] It seems that they sought, by an increased show of respect, to overcome the coolness of the public, and to put in strong relief the high dignity of their guest. Mary, in order to give to the occasion a more festal air, entered during the repast, carrying a vase of perfume, which she poured upon the feet of Jesus. She then broke the vase, following an ancient custom of breaking the vessel that has been used to honour a stranger of distinction.[3] Finally, carrying her homage to a degree without precedent, she prostrated herself, and wiped with her long hair her master's feet.[4] The house was filled with the pleasant odour of the perfume, to the great delight of all except the avaricious Judas of Kerioth. If we consider the sparing habits of the group, this was a real waste. The greedy treasurer reckoned up immediately how much the perfume might have been sold for, and what it would have realised for the poor-box. This cool temper dis-

[1] Matt. xxvi. 6; Mark. xiv. 3: comp. Luke vii. 40, 43, 44.

[2] This would not be unlikely even if it were not in her own house. Such service at another's board, from a near friend, or relative, is common in the East.

[3] I have seen the same thing done at Sour.

[4] We here call to mind the attitude of the guests, reclining on the *triclinium*, or divan, with their feet on their own level, not hid under the table.

pleased Jesus, seeming to place something else above the regard due to him. He loved honours, for honours furthered his aim by confirming his title as Son of David. So when they spoke to him of the poor he replied, somewhat sharply, "The poor will be always with you; but me you will not always have;" and, with rising emotion, he promised immortal remembrance to the woman who in this critical moment thus gave him a token of her love.[1]

The next day (Sunday, the 9th of Nisan) he went down from Bethany to Jerusalem.[2] When, at a bend of the road, he saw from the summit of the Mount of Olives the city spread out before him, it is said he wept over it, and addressed to it a last appeal.[3] On the slope of the mountain, near a suburb called *Bethphage*,[4] occupied mostly by priests, Jesus had once more a moment of human satisfaction.[5] His arrival was already noised abroad. The Galileans who had come to the feast were highly elated by it, and prepared a little triumph for him. A she-ass was brought to him, followed, according to custom, by her colt.[6] The Gali-

[1] Matt. xxvi. 6–13; Mark. xiv. 3–9; John xi. 2 and xii. 2–8: comp. Luke vii. 36–50.

[2] John xii. 12.

[3] Luke xix. 41–44 ("If thou hadst known," etc.).

[4] Matt. xxi. 1; Mark xi. 1; Luke xix. 29. Mishna, *Menachoth*, xi. 2. Babylonian Talmud, *Sanhedrin*, 14 *b*; *Pesachim*, 63 *b*, 91 *a*; *Sota*, 45 *a*; *Baba Metsia*, 88 *a*; *Menachoth*, 78 *b*, *Sifra*, 104 *b*. Eusebius and Jerome, *De situ*, etc. (ed. of Martianay), ii. 442. Jer. *Epitaph. Paulæ* (iv. 676); comm. in Matt. xxi. 1 (iv. 94); *Lex. græc. nom.* etc. (ii. 121, 122).

[5] Matt. xxi. 1–9; Mark xi. 1–10; Luke xix. 29–36; John xii. 12–16. The comparison with Zech. ix. 9 throws a slight doubt upon this incident: the triumphal entrance riding upon an ass was a messianic token. Comp. Babylonian Talmud, *Sanhedrin*, 98 *b*; Midrash, *Bereschith rabba*, xcviii.; Midrash, *Koheleth*, i. 9.

[6] This petty incident may have arisen from a misunderstanding of the

leans spread their finest garments as saddle-cloths upon the back of this humble animal, and seated him thereon. Others, meanwhile, spread their garments upon the road, and strewed it with green branches [fronds of palm]. The multitude which went before and after, carrying palms, cried, "Hosanna to the son of David! Blessed is he that comes in the name of the Lord!" Some few even gave him the title King of Israel.[1] "Master, rebuke thy disciples," said the Pharisees to him. "If these should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out," replied Jesus; and he entered the city.

The inhabitants of the capital, who hardly knew him, asked who he was. "It is Jesus, the prophet of Nazareth, in Galilee," was the reply. Jerusalem was a city of about fifty thousand souls.[2] A trifling event, like the entrance of a stranger of some little celebrity, or the arrival of a band of provincials, or a commotion among people in the city streets, could not fail, under ordinary circumstances, to be quickly noised about But at festival seasons the confusion was extreme.[3] Jerusalem at such times was taken possession of by strangers; and among these the excitement appears to have been greatest. Some Greek-speaking proselytes who had come to the feast, piqued with curiosity,

passage in Zechariah, owing to the ignorance of the New Testament writers as to the rules of Hebrew parallelism. Comp. John xix. 24.

[1] Luke xix. 38; John xii. 13.

[2] The number one hundred and twenty thousand (Hecatæus in Josephus, *c. Ap.* i. 22) seems too great. Cicero apparently slurs it as a petty fortress [in the epithet *Hierosolymarius* applied to Pompey]: *Ad Att.* ii. 9. The old walls, however described, do not admit a population fourfold the present, which is less than fifteen thousand. See Robinson, *Bibl. Res.* i. 421, 2d ed.; Fergusson, *Typography of Jerusalem*, 51; Foster, *Syria and Palestine*, 82.

[3] Josephus, *Wars*, II. xiv. 3; VI. ix. 3.

wished to see Jesus, and applied to his disciples; but we do not know much of the result of the interview.[1] According to his custom, Jesus went to pass the night at his beloved village of Bethany.[2] The three following days (Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday) he went down to Jerusalem as before; after sunset he returned either to Bethany or to the rustic dwellings on the western slope of the Mount of Olives, where he had many friends.[3]

A deep melancholy seems during these last days to have filled the soul of Jesus, generally so cheerful and serene. All the narratives agree in attributing to him before his arrest a season of doubt and trouble, — a kind of anticipatory death-struggle. According to some, he cried out suddenly, "Now is my soul troubled! O Father, save me from this hour!"[4] It was believed that a voice from heaven was heard at this moment; others said that an angel came to console him.[5] According to one widely-spread account this befell him in the garden of Gethsemane. It is said that he went about a stone's-throw from his sleeping disciples, taking with him only Peter and the two sons of Zebedee; then prayed, with his face bowed to the earth. His soul was sad, even to death; a terrible anguish weighed upon him: but resignation to the divine will prevailed.[6] This scene, owing to the instinctive art which has controlled the narrative of the

[1] John xii. 20–22. [2] Matt. xxi. 17; Mark. xi. 11.

[3] Matt. xxi. 17, 18; Mark. xi. 11, 12, 19; Luke xxi. 37, 38.

[4] John xii. 27–32. The lofty tone of this evangelist and his exclusive attention to the divine office of Jesus, naturally effaced from the narrative those traits of human weakness related by the Synoptics.

[5] Luke xxii. 43; John xii. 28, 29.

[6] Matt. xxvi. 36-41; Mark xiv. 32–38; Luke xxii. 39–46.

Synoptics, and often made them yield in its arrangement to motives of fitness or effect, is referred to the last night of Jesus' life, and to the very moment of his arrest. If such a version were the true one, we could hardly understand why John, who had been the intimate witness of so touching an event, should not have mentioned it to his disciples, or that the compiler of the Fourth Gospel should not have made it prominent in the very circumstantial account he has given of the evening of that Thursday.[1]

All we are able to say is, that, during these last days, the enormous weight of the mission Jesus had undertaken cruelly oppressed him. It was the momentary reaction of human nature. Perhaps he detected in himself a doubt about his work. Terror and misgiving seized upon him, and threw him into a state of exhaustion worse than death. The man who has sacrificed his repose and the legitimate rewards of life to a great idea always experiences a moment of sad revulsion when the image of death forces itself upon him for the first time, and seeks to persuade him that all is vanity. Perhaps some of those keen memories held fast in the strongest souls, which at times pierce like a sword, came upon Jesus at this moment. Did he recall the clear fountains of Galilee, where he might have refreshed himself; the vine and the fig-tree under which he might have sat; the young maidens who perhaps might have consented to love him? Did he deplore the bitter destiny that had denied him the joys conceded to all others?

[1] This would be the less intelligible, since the fourth evangelist makes it a point to put in relief circumstances personal to the Apostle John, or those which he alone had witnessed (i. 35–37; xiii. 23–26; xviii. 15–18; xix. 25–27, 35; xx. 2–5; xxi. 20–25.

Did he regret his too lofty nature, and (a victim of his greatness) did he grieve that he had not remained a simple artisan of Nazareth? We do not know: all these internal troubles were evidently to his disciples a sealed letter. They understood nothing of them, supplying by simple conjectures what was obscure to them in the great soul of their Master. It is certain, at least, that his divine nature soon regained its supremacy. He might still have avoided death; but he would not. Love for his work prevailed. He elected to drink the cup even to the dregs. Henceforth, in fact, we find Jesus entirely himself, wholly unclouded. The subtilties of the polemic, the credulity of the wonder-worker and the exorcist, are forgotten. There remains only the incomparable hero of the Passion, the founder of the rights of free conscience, and the perfect model which all suffering souls will contemplate in order to find strength and solace.

The triumph of Bethphage — that audacious act of the provincials in celebrating at the very gates of Jerusalem the advent of their Messiah-King — completed the exasperation of the Pharisees and of the Temple aristocracy. A new council was held on the Wednesday (12th of Nisan) at the house of Joseph Caiaphas.[1] The immediate arrest of Jesus was resolved upon. A rigid purpose of order and of keeping the peace presided over all their plans. The question was how to avoid a scene. As the Feast of the Passover (a seven-days' festival which that year began on the Friday evening) was a time of bustle and excitement, it was resolved to anticipate these days. Jesus was dear to the

[1] Matt. xxvi. 1–5; Mark xiv. 1, 2; Luke xxii. 1, 2.

people;[1] they feared an outbreak. Although it was customary to put in relief the solemnities to which the whole nation gathered by the execution of those rebellious to priestly authority, — a sort of *auto-da-fé* designed to impress the people with religious terror,[2] — it was probably arranged that such executions should not fall upon the festal days.[3] The arrest was therefore fixed for the next day, Thursday. It was resolved, further, not to seize him in the Temple, whither he came every day,[4] but to observe his habits, in order to arrest him in some retired place. The agents of the priests sounded his disciples, hoping to obtain some information by playing upon their weakness or their simplicity. They found what they sought in Judas of Kerioth. This wretched creature, from motives impossible to explain, betrayed his Master, gave all the needed information, and undertook himself (although such an excess of baseness is hardly credible) to conduct the force which was to make the arrest.

The memory of horror which the folly or depravity of this man has left in the Christian tradition must have led to some exaggeration here. Up to this time Judas had been a disciple like the others; he had even the title of Apostle; he had wrought miracles and driven out demons. Legend, which will have only strongly contrasted colours, has consented to admit in the supper-chamber nothing but just eleven saints and one reprobate. Reality does not proceed in such absolute fashion. Avarice, which the Synoptics give

[1] Matt. xxi. 46.

[2] Mishna, *Sanhedrin*, xi. 4; Babylonian Talmud, *ibid.* 89 *a* (comp. Acts xii. 3–5).

[3] Mishna, *Sanhedrin*, iv. 1.

[4] Matt. xxvi. 55.

as the motive of this crime, is not enough to explain it. It would be singular if a man who kept the purse, and who knew what he would lose by the death of his chief, were to barter the profits of his position[1] against a very small sum of money.[2] Had the self-love of Judas been wounded by the sharp lesson he received during the dinner at Bethany? Even that would not suffice to explain his conduct. The fourth evangelist would have it that he was a thief, an unbeliever, from the beginning,[3] which is not at all likely. We would rather believe there was some feeling of jealousy, or some discord among the disciples. The peculiar animosity shown toward Judas[4] in the Gospel attributed to John confirms this view. Less pure in heart than the others, Judas may have imbibed, without knowing it, the narrow-mindedness of his office. By a caprice, very common in active life, he had come to value higher the interests of the purse than those of the work for which the purse was meant. The administrator had slain the Apostle. The murmur that escaped him at Bethany seems to suggest that sometimes he found the Master costing too dear to his spiritual family. No doubt this paltry thrift had been the occasion of many other collisions in the little society.

Without denying that Judas of Kerioth aided in the arrest of his Master, we yet believe that the curses with which he is loaded have a shade of injustice. In what he did, he was perhaps more stupid than

[1] John xii. 6.

[2] The Fourth Gospel does not even allude to pay. The "thirty pieces of silver" of the Synoptics are taken from Zech. xi. 12, 13.

[3] John vi. 65; xii. 6.

[4] John vi. 65, 71, 72; xii. 6; xiii. 2, 27–30.

wicked. The moral sense of a man of the people is quick and true, but unstable and inconsequent; it cannot resist the impulse of the moment. The secret societies of the republican party held at heart much sincerity of conviction, and yet informers among them were very numerous. Only a trifling spite was needed to convert a partisan into a traitor. But if the mad desire for a few pieces of silver turned the head of poor Judas, he does not seem to have wholly lost his moral sense; for, on seeing the consequences of his crime, he repented,[1] and, it is said, killed himself.

Each minute at this crisis becomes solemn, and has counted more than whole ages in the history of humanity. We have reached Thursday, the 13th of Nisan (April). On the evening of the next day the festival of the Passover began with a feast, at which the paschal lamb was consumed, and continued for seven days, during which unleavened bread was eaten. The first and the last of these seven days were of a peculiarly solemn character. The disciples were already busied with preparations for the feast.[2] As for Jesus, we are led to believe that he was aware of the treachery of Judas, and that he anticipated the fate which awaited him. In the evening he took his last repast with his disciples. It was not the ritual feast of the Passover, as was afterwards supposed, owing to an error of a day in reckoning;[3] but for the primitive

[1] Matt. xxvii. 3–5.

[2] Matt. xxvi. 17–19; Mark xiv. 12–16; Luke xxii. 7–13; John xiii. 29.

[3] This is the view of the Synoptics (Matt. xxvi. 17; Mark xiv. 12; Luke xxii. 7–15), and consequently of Justin (*Tryph.* 17, 88, 97, 100, 111). The Fourth Gospel, on the contrary, formally assumes that Jesus died on the very day the lamb was eaten (xiii. 1, 2, 29; xviii. 28; xix. 14, 31). The Talmud (surely a weak authority on such a point) also makes Jesus

Church this supper of the Thursday was the true Passover, the seal of the new covenant. Each disciple connected with it his most cherished memories, and a multitude of touching traits of the Master which each preserved were associated with this repast, which became the corner-stone of Christian piety and the starting-point of the most fruitful institutions.

Doubtless the tender love which filled the heart of Jesus for the little church that surrounded him overflowed at this moment.[1] His serene and strong soul bore itself lightly under the weight of the gloomy apprehensions that beset him. He had a word for each of his friends: John and Peter especially were the objects of tender marks of attachment. John reclined on the divan, by the side of Jesus, his head resting against the breast of the Master.[2] Towards the end of the repast, the secret which weighed upon the heart of Jesus nearly escaped him: "In truth," he said, "I declare to you that one of you will betray me."[3] This was for these simple men a moment of anguish;

die "the day before the Passover" (Babylonian Talmud, *Sanhedrin*, 43 *a*, 67 *a*). A serious objection to this opinion is that late in the second century the churches of Asia Minor, professing a doctrine on the Passover [Easter], a doctrine that seems to contradict the view of the Fourth Gospel, appealed to the authority of the Apostle John himself and his disciples in support of a doctrine consenting with the account of the Synoptics. (Polycrates in Euseb. *Hist.* v. 34: comp. *Chron. pasc.* p. 6 *et seq.*, ed. Du Cange.) But the question is very obscure. John and his disciples may have kept the Passover, like all the primitive Apostolic school, on the 14th of Nisan, not because they believed that Jesus had eaten the lamb on that day, but because they believed that he, the true paschal lamb (see John i. 29, and xix. 36, with Rev. v. 6), had been slain on that day.

[1] John xiii. and the succeeding chapters.

[2] John xiii. 23; Polycrates in Euseb. *Hist.* v. 24.

[3] Matt. xxvi. 21–25; Mark xiv. 18–21; Luke xxii. 21–23; John xiii. 21–30, and xxi. 29.

they looked at one another, and each questioned himself. Judas was present: perhaps Jesus, who had for some time had reasons to distrust him, sought by this remark to draw from his looks or from his embarrassed manner the avowal of his fault. But the unfaithful disciple did not lose countenance; he even dared, it is said, to ask with the others, "Master, is it I?"

Meanwhile, the good and upright soul of Peter was in torture. He made a sign to John to learn if possible of whom the Master was speaking. John, who could converse with Jesus without being heard, asked him the meaning of this enigma. Jesus, having only suspicions, did not wish to give any name; he only told John to observe him to whom he was going to offer a morsel dipped in the seasoned broth: at the same time he soaked a mouthful and offered it to Judas.[1] John and Peter alone had knowledge of the fact. Jesus addressed to Judas some words containing a keen reproach, which were not understood by those present. They thought that Jesus was simply giving him orders for the morrow's feast, and he left the room.[2]

At the time, this incident made no impression; and, apart from the apprehensions which the Master confided to his disciples, who only half understood, nothing extraordinary took place. But after the death of Jesus they attached to this evening a singularly solemn meaning, and the imagination of believers spread over it a colouring of gentle mysticism. The last hours of a

[1] In the East, as a mark of favour to a guest, the master of the feast gives him, once or twice during the repast, morsels of food which he compounds and seasons as he will.

[2] John xiii. 21–30, which relieves the improbabilities of the Synoptic account.

dear friend are those we best remember. By an inevitable illusion, we lend to the conversations we have then had with him a sense given them only by death; we concentrate into a few hours the memories of many years. The majority of the disciples, after the supper of which we have just spoken, saw their Master no more. It was the farewell banquet. In this repast, as well as in many others,[1] Jesus practised his mysterious rite of the breaking of bread. As it was believed in the earliest years of the Church that this repast took place on the day of the Passover, and was the paschal feast, the idea naturally arose that the Eucharist was established at this supreme moment. Starting from the hypothesis that Jesus knew in advance the precise moment of his own death, the disciples were led to suppose that he reserved for his last hours a number of important acts. As, moreover, one of the fundamental ideas of the first Christians was that the death of Jesus had been a sacrifice, substituted for all those of the ancient Law, the "Last Supper"[2] — which was supposed to have taken place, once for all, on the eve of the crucifixion — became eminently the sacrifice, the act constituting the new covenant, the sign of the blood shed for the salvation of all. The bread and wine, conjoined with the death itself, were thus the image of the new testament that Jesus had sealed with his sufferings, the commemoration of the sacrifice of Christ to be observed until his second coming.[3]

Very early this mystery was incorporated into a brief sacramental narrative, which we possess under four

[1] Luke xxix. 30, 31, 35, represents the breaking of bread as a characteristic act of Jesus (compare *ante*, pp. 301–306).

[2] Luke xxii. 20.

[3] 1 Cor. xi. 26.

forms,[1] very similar to one another. Preoccupied with the Eucharistic ideas,[2] the fourth evangelist, who narrates the last supper at such length, connecting it with so many circumstances and discourses,[3] knows nothing of this narrative. This is a proof that the sect whose tradition he records did not regard the Eucharist as a special feature of the supper. To the fourth evangelist the peculiar rite of the occasion is the washing of feet. It is probable that in certain primitive Christian families this rite held an importance which it has since lost.[4] No doubt Jesus, on some occasions, had practised it to give his disciples an example of brotherly humility. It was connected with the eve of his death, in consequence of the tendency to group around the supper all the great moral and ritual precepts of Jesus.

Moreover, a high sentiment of love, concord, charity, and mutual deference animated the recollections which were believed to be preserved of the last hours of Jesus.[5] The unity of his Church, constituted by him or by his Spirit, is always the soul of the symbols and discourses which Christian tradition referred to this sacred hour. "I give you a new commandment," said he, "that you love one another, as I have loved you. By this all men will know that you are my dis-

[1] Matt. xxvi. 26–28; Mark. xiv. 22–24; Luke xxii. 19–21; 1 Cor. xi. 23–25.

[2] Chap. vi.

[3] Chaps. xiii.–xvii.

[4] John xiii. 14, 15; comp. Matt. xxvi. 26-30; Luke xxii. 19, 20.

[5] John xiii.–xvii. The discourses contained in these chapters cannot be taken as historical. They are full of turns of thought and expressions which are not at all in the manner of Jesus' own discourses, but, on the contrary, fall exactly into the habitual style of the writings ascribed to John. Thus the expression "little children" as a form of address (John xiii. 33) is very frequent in the first epistle bearing the name of John, but is never heard from the lips of Jesus.

ciples, if you love one another." [1] At this sacred moment rivalries and struggles for precedence still took place.[2] Jesus remarked that if he, the Master, had been in the midst of his disciples as their servant, how much more ought they to submit themselves to one another. According to some, while drinking the wine, he said, "I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it anew with you in my Father's kingdom." [3] According to others, he promised them soon a celestial feast, at which they would be seated on thrones at his side.[4]

It seems that toward the close of the evening the presentiments of Jesus took hold upon the disciples. All felt that a very serious danger threatened the Master, and that they were verging on a crisis. At one moment he thought of precautions, and spoke of swords. There were two in the company. "It is enough," said he.[5] He did not, however, follow out this idea; he saw clearly that timid provincials could not stand up before the armed force of the great powers of Jerusalem. Peter, full of zeal and self-confidence, swore that he would go with him to prison and to death. Jesus, with his usual clear-sightedness, expressed to him certain doubts. According to a tradition, which probably went back to Peter himself, Jesus set his hour at the cock-crowing.[6] Like Peter, they all averred that they would not yield.

[1] John xiii. 33–35; xv. 12–17.

[2] Luke xxii. 24–27: comp. John xiii. 4–11.

[3] Matt. xxvi. 29; Mark xiv. 25; Luke xxii. 18.

[4] Luke xxii. 29, 30.

[5] Luke xxii. 36–38.

[6] Matt. xxvi. 31–35; Mark xiv. 29–31; Luke xxii. 31–33; John xiii. 36–38.

CHAPTER XXIV.

ARREST AND TRIAL.

It was already night[1] when they left the room.[2] Jesus, as was his wont, passed through the valley of Kedron, and, accompanied by his disciples, went to the garden of Gethsemane, at the foot of the Mount of Olives.[3] Here he sat down. Overawing his friends by his loftier nature, he watched and prayed. They were sleeping near him, when suddenly an armed troop appeared bearing lighted torches. It was the guards of the Temple armed with clubs, — a police force at the disposal of the priests, supported by a detachment of Roman soldiers with their swords, and an order of arrest coming from the high-priest and the Sanhedrim.[4] Judas, who knew the habits of Jesus, had indicated this as the place where he might most easily be surprised. The earlier tradition is agreed that Judas himself accompanied the force;[5] according to some, he carried his hateful conduct so far as to make the sign of betrayal with a kiss.[6] Be that as it may, there was certainly

[1] John xiii. 30.

[2] The singing of a hymn, related in Matt. xxvi. 30, Mark xiv. 26, and Justin's *Trypho*, 106, accords with the Synoptic view that the Last Supper was the Passover feast. Psalms were sung both before and after this feast: see Babylonian Talmud, *Pesachim*, ix. 3, fol. 118 *a*.

[3] Matt. xxvi. 36; Mark xiv. 32; Luke xxii. 39; John xviii. 1, 2.

[4] Matt. xxvi. 47; Mark xiv. 43; John xviii. 3, 12.

[5] Ibid.; also Luke xxii. 47; Acts i. 16. 1 Cor. xi. 23 seems to imply it.

[6] The Synoptic tradition. In the Fourth Gospel Jesus is said to have voluntarily surrendered himself (John xviii. 4-8).

some show of resistance on the part of the disciples.[1] Peter, it is said, drew his sword and wounded one of the servants of the high-priest, named Malchus, on the ear.[2] Jesus put a stop to this resistance, and surrendered himself to the soldiers. Weak and incapable of acting together, especially against such high authority, the disciples took flight and scattered. Peter and John, alone, did not lose sight of their Master. Another young man (probably Mark), wrapped in a light garment, was in the company: him the authorities sought to arrest, but he fled, leaving his tunic in the hands of the guards.[3]

The course which the priests had resolved to follow against Jesus was in strict conformity with the established law. The procedure against the "deceiver" (*mésith*), who seeks to corrupt the purity of religion, is set forth in the Talmud, with details so shamelessly frank as to provoke a smile. A judicial ambush is made an essential part of the criminal process. When a man is accused of false teaching, two witnesses are secretly posted behind a screen, and it is arranged to bring the accused into an adjoining room, where he can be heard by these two witnesses without perceiving them himself. Two candles are lighted near him, so that it may be distinctly said that the witnesses "see him."[4] He is then made to repeat his blasphemy, and urged to retract it. If he persists, the witnesses who

[1] Here the several traditions are in accord.

[2] Matt. xxvi. 51, 52; Mark xiv. 47; Luke xxii. 50, 51; John xviii. 10. [Luke relates that Jesus miraculously healed the severed ear.]

[3] Mark xiv. 51, 52. Mark (who alone tells the incident) lived at Jerusalem (Acts xii. 12).

[4] On a criminal charge, only eye-witnesses were admitted: Mishna, *Sanhedrin*, iv. 5.

have heard him attend him to the tribunal, and he is stoned. The Talmud adds that this was the way in which Jesus was dealt with: he was condemned on the faith of two witnesses who had been posted for the purpose; and, further, that this is the only crime for which the witnesses are thus prepared.[1]

In fact, the disciples of Jesus inform us that the crime with which their Master was charged was that of "misleading;"[2] and, apart from some minutiæ, the product of rabbinical fancy, the gospel narrative follows step by step the procedure described in the Talmud. The plan of the enemies of Jesus was to convict him, by questioning of witnesses and by his own avowals, of blasphemy and of attack upon the Mosaic religion; to condemn him to death according to law, and then to get the condemnation approved by Pilate. The priestly authority, as we have already seen, was in fact wholly in the hands of Hanan, and the order for the arrest probably came from him. To the residence of this powerful personage Jesus was first taken.[3] Hanan questioned him in regard to his doctrine and his disciples. Jesus, with proper self-respect, declined to enter into long explanations. He referred Hanan to his teachings, which had been public; he declared that he had never held any secret doctrine, and appealed to the late high-priest to examine those who had heard him. This was a perfectly natural reply; but the idolatrous respect that surrounded the

[1] Jerusalem Talmud, *Sanhedrin*, xiv. 16; Babylonian Talmud, *ibid.* 43 *a*, 67 *a* (comp. *Schabbath*, 104 *b*).

[2] Matt. xxvii. 63; John vii. 12, 47. [The Greek verb is πλανᾷν, "to lead astray" (as a false guide).]

[3] John xviii. 13, 24. This circumstance, found only in the Fourth Gospel, is a strong proof of its historical value.

old pontiff made it seem too bold, and one of the by-standers answered it, we are told, by a blow.

Peter and John had followed their Master to Hanan's house. John, who was here well known, was admitted without difficulty; but Peter was stopped at the entrance, and John had to beg the porter to let him pass. The night was cold. Peter remained in the antechamber, and drew near a brazier around which the servants were warming themselves. He was soon recognised as a disciple of the accused. The unfortunate man, betrayed by his Galilean accent and pursued by questions from the servants, — one of whom was a kinsman of Malchus, and had seen him at Gethsemane, — denied three times over that he had ever had the slightest connection with Jesus. He supposed that Jesus could not hear him, and never dreamt that this skulking cowardice was base to the last degree. But his better nature soon showed him the vile thing he had done. A chance circumstance, the crowing of a cock, recalled to him what Jesus had said to him. Touched to the heart, he went out and wept bitterly.[1]

Hanan, although the real author of the judicial murder about to be committed, had not power to pronounce sentence upon Jesus; so he sent him to his son-in-law, Caiaphas, who bore the official title. This man, the blind tool of his father-in-law, had of course to ratify everything. The Sanhedrim was assembled at his house.[2] The inquiry began: several witnesses, well instructed beforehand, according to the inquisitorial

[1] Matt. xxvi. 69–75; Mark xiv. 66–72; Luke xxii. 55–62; John xviii. 15–18, 25–27.

[2] Matt. xxvi. 57; Mark iv. 53; Luke xxii. 66.

process described in the Talmud, appeared before the tribunal. The fatal sentence which Jesus had really uttered, "I am able to destroy the Temple of God and to build it in three days," was cited by two witnesses. To blaspheme the Temple of God was, according to the Jewish law, equivalent to blaspheming God himself.[1] Jesus kept silence, and refused to explain the asserted speech. If we may believe one version, the high-priest then adjured him to say if he were the Messiah; Jesus confessed it, and even proclaimed before the assembly the near approach of his heavenly reign.[2] The courage of Jesus, who had resolved to die, did not require this. It is more probable that here, as before Hanan, he remained silent. This was, in general, his rule of conduct during his last hours. The sentence was already written; only pretexts were sought for. Jesus perceived this, and did not undertake a useless defence. From the point of view of Jewish orthodoxy he was truly a blasphemer, a destroyer of the established worship; and these crimes were punishable by the law with death.[3] With one voice, the assembly declared him guilty of a capital crime. Those members of the council who secretly inclined to him were absent or did not vote.[4] The recklessness usual in old-established aristocracies did not permit the judges to reflect long upon the consequences of the sentence they pronounced. Human life was at that time very lightly sacrificed; and the members of the Sanhedrim could not, of course, dream that their sons would have to render account to

[1] Matt. xxiii. 16–22.

[2] Matt. xxvi. 64; Mark xiv. 62; Luke xxii. 69. The Fourth Gospel speaks of no such incident.

[3] Levit. xxiv. 14–16; Deut. xiii. 1–5.

[4] Luke xxiii. 50, 51.

an indignant posterity for the sentence pronounced with such flippant disdain.

The Sanhedrim had not the right to put in execution a sentence of death;[1] but, in the confusion of powers which then prevailed in Judæa, Jesus was from that moment none the less a condemned man. He remained the rest of the night exposed to the ill treatment of a base rabble of servants, who spared him no affront.[2]

In the morning the chief priests and the elders again assembled.[3] The question was, how to get Pilate to ratify a condemnation pronounced by the Sanhedrim, but invalid by reason of the Roman occupation. The procurator was not invested, like the imperial legate, with the power of life and death. But Jesus was not a Roman citizen: it only required the authority of the governor, to carry through the sentence pronounced against him. As always happens when a people of political habit rules a nation in which the civil and the religious laws are confounded, the Romans had been led to give a sort of official sanction to the Jewish law. The Roman code did not apply to Jews, who continued under the canonical law recorded in the Talmud, just as the Arabs in Algeria are still governed by the code of Islam. Though neutral in religion, the Romans thus very often sanctioned penalties inflicted for religious offences. The situation was much like that of the sacred cities of India under the English dominion; or, rather, that which would be the state of Damascus

[1] John xviii. 31; Josephus, *Antiq.* XX. ix. 1; Jerusalem Talmud, *Sanhedrin*, i. 4.

[2] Matt. xxvi. 67, 68; Mark xiv. 65; Luke xxii. 63–65.

[3] Matt. xxvii. 1; Mark xv. 1; Luke xxii. 66 and xxiii. 1; John xviii. 28.

if Syria should be conquered by a European nation. Josephus asserts (though the statement may be doubted) that if a Roman ever ventured beyond the pillars which bore inscriptions forbidding Pagans to advance, the Romans themselves delivered him to the Jews to be put to death.[1]

The agents of the priests therefore bound Jesus and led him to the judgment-hall, which was the former palace of Herod,[2] adjoining the Tower of Antonia.[3] It was the morning of the day on which the paschal lamb was to be eaten (Friday the 14th of Nisan, our 3d of April). The Jews would have been defiled by entering the judgment-hall, and disabled from sharing the sacred feast; accordingly they remained outside.[4] Pilate, apprised of their presence, ascended the *bema*[5] or tribunal, situated in the open air,[6] at the place named *Gabbatha* (in Greek Λιθόστρωτον, "pavement"), on account of the flagstones which covered the ground.

Hardly had he been informed of the accusation when he manifested his annoyance at being implicated in the affair.[7] He then shut himself up in the judgment-hall with Jesus. Here a conversation took place, the precise details of which are lost, no witness having been able to repeat it to the disciples; but its tenor appears to have been happily conjectured by the fourth evangelist. His narrative, at least, is in perfect accord with what history tells us of the respective positions of the two speakers.

[1] Josephus, *Antiq.* XV. xi. 5; *Wars*, VI. ii. 4.
[2] Philo, *Legatio ad Caium*, 38; Josephus, *Wars*, II. xiv. 8.
[3] Where now is the palace of the governor of Jerusalem.
[4] John xiv. 8; xviii. 28.
[5] The Greek word βῆμα had been adopted in Syro-Chaldaic.
[6] Josephus, *Wars*, II. ix. 3; xiv. 8. Matt. xxvii. 27. John xviii. 33.
[7] John xviii. 29.

The procurator, Pontius (surnamed Pilate, doubtless on account of the *pilum* or javelin of honour with which he or one of his ancestors was decorated),[1] had hitherto had nothing to do with the new sect. Indifferent to the internal quarrels of the Jews, he saw in all these sectarian movements only the effects of diseased imagination and disordered brains. In general, he did not like the Jews. The Jews, on their part, detested him still more: they considered him harsh, scornful, and passionate, and accused him of improbable crimes.[2] Jerusalem, as the centre of a great popular ferment, was a very seditious city, and an unendurable abode for a foreigner. The enthusiasts insisted that it was a fixed design of the new procurator to abolish the Jewish law.[3] Their narrow fanaticism, their religious hates, shocked that broad sentiment of justice and of civil government which the commonest Roman carried with him everywhere. All the acts of Pilate known to us attest him to have been a good administrator.[4] In the earlier period of the exercise of his charge, he had had difficulties with his subjects which he solved in a very brutal manner; but it seems that on the whole he was right. The Jews must have appeared to him a very backward people; he doubtless judged them as a liberal prefect formerly judged the lower Bretons, who rebelled for such a simple matter as a new road or the establishment of a school. In his best projects for the good of the country, notably

[1] Virgil, *Æneid*, xii. 121; Martial, *Epig.* i. 32 and x. 48; Plutarch, *Rom.* 29: comp. the *hasta pura* as a military decoration (Orelli and Henzen, *Inscr. Lat.* 3574, 6852, etc. The form *Pilatus* is thus a designation like *Galeatus*, *Torquatus*, etc.

[2] Philo, *Leg. ad Caium*, 38.

[3] Josephus, *Antiq.* XVIII. iii. 1.

[4] Ibid. iii. iv.

in everything relating to public works, he had encountered an impassable obstacle in the Law. The Law narrowed life to such a point that it opposed all change and every improvement. The Roman structures, even the most useful, were objects of great antipathy to zealous Jews.[1] Two votive escutcheons with inscriptions, affixed by Pilate to his residence which was near the sacred precincts, provoked a still more violent storm.[2] He at first cared little for these displays of temper; and he thus soon found himself engaged in bloody repressions,[3] which afterward led to his removal.[4] The experience of so many conflicts had rendered him very prudent in his relations with an intractable populace, which took vengeance on its rulers by forcing them to acts of an odious severity. With extreme displeasure, he now found himself led on to play a cruel part in this new affair, in support of a law he hated.[5] He knew that religious fanaticism, when it has obtained some violent act from civil governments, is thereafter the first to throw the responsibility upon them, almost making these very acts a ground of accusation. What could be more unjust? for in such cases the instigator is the real criminal.

Pilate, then, would have desired to save Jesus. Perhaps the calm and dignified attitude of the accused made an impression upon him. According to one tradition (not very well grounded, it is true),[6] Jesus found a supporter in the procurator's own wife, who had been distressed, she said, by an evil dream. She may have

[1] Babylonian Talmud, *Schabbath*, 33 *b*.
[2] Philo, *Leg. ad Caium*, 38.
[3] Josephus, *Antiq.* XVIII. iii. 1, 2; *Wars*, II. ix. 2, 3. Luke xiii. 1.
[4] Josephus, *Antiq.* XVIII. iv. 1, 2.
[5] John xviii. 35.
[6] Matt. xxvii. 19.

seen the gentle Galilean from some window of the palace, which overlooked the courts of the Temple. Perhaps she had seen him again in her dreams; and the blood of this gifted youth, which was about to be spilt, had invaded her sleep with horrors. Certain it is that Jesus found Pilate prepossessed in his favour. The governor questioned him kindly, with the desire of finding out how by any means he could send him away pardoned.

The title "King of the Jews," which Jesus had never taken upon himself, but which his enemies represented as the sum and substance of his acts and pretensions, was naturally the best ground on which they might excite the jealousy of Roman power. He was accused of sedition, as being guilty of treason against the State. Nothing could be more unjust, for Jesus had always recognised the Roman empire as the established power; but conservative religious parties are not wont to shrink from calumny. In spite of him they drew all sorts of conclusions from his teaching: they made him out to be a disciple of Judas the Gaulonite; they asserted that he forbade the payment of tribute to Cæsar.[1] Pilate asked him if he was really the King of the Jews.[2] Jesus disguised nothing of his thought; but the great ambiguity of speech which had been the source of his strength, and which after his death was to establish his kingship, was his destruction now. Idealist as he was, — that is, not distinguishing the spirit from the substance, — Jesus, whose words (to use the image of the Apocalypse) were as a two-edged sword, never fully conciliated the powers of earth. If we may be-

[1] Luke xxiii. 2, 5.

[2] Matt. xxvii. 11; Mark xv. 2; Luke xxiii. 3; John xviii. 33.

lieve the Fourth Gospel, he did avow his royalty, but coupled it with this profound saying: "My kingdom is not of this world," explaining then the nature of his kingdom, which consists entirely in holding and proclaiming the truth. Pilate knew nothing of this grand idealism.[1] Jesus doubtless appeared to him an inoffensive dreamer. The total absence of religious and philosophical proselyting among the Romans of this time made them regard devotion to truth as a chimera. Such discussions annoyed them, and appeared to them devoid of meaning. Not perceiving the element of danger to the Empire that lay hidden in these new speculations, they had no reason to employ violence against them. All their displeasure fell upon those who asked them to inflict punishment for vain subtilties. Twenty years after, Gallio still followed the same course towards the Jews.[2] Until the fall of Jerusalem, the Roman rule of administration was to remain completely indifferent to these quarrels of sectaries among themselves.[3]

An expedient offered itself to the mind of the governor, to reconcile his own feelings with the demands of the fanatical people, whose obstinate pressure he had already so often felt. It was the custom on occasion of the Passover to deliver a prisoner to the people. Pilate, knowing that Jesus had been arrested merely in consequence of the jealousy of the priests,[4] tried to give

[1] John xviii. 38.

[2] Acts xviii. 14, 15.

[3] Tacitus (*Ann.* xv. 44) speaks of the death of Jesus as a political act of Pilate. But when Tacitus wrote, the Roman policy towards Christians had changed: they were held guilty of secret conspiracy against the State. The historian naturally thought that Pilate, in putting Jesus to death, was governed by reasons of public safety. Josephus is more correct (*Antiq.* XVIII. iii. 3).

[4] Mark xv. 10.

him the benefit of this custom. He appeared again upon the *bema*, and proposed to the multitude to release the "King of the Jews." The proposition made in these terms, though ironical, had in it a certain tone of liberality. The priests saw the danger. They acted promptly,[1] and, as a set-off to Pilate's proposal, they suggested to the crowd the name of a prisoner who enjoyed great popularity in Jerusalem. By a singular coincidence he also was called Jesus,[2] and bore the surname of Bar-Abba, or Bar-Rabban.[3] He was a well-known person,[4] and had been arrested as an assassin, in consequence of a revolt accompanied by murder.[5] A general clamour was raised: "Not this man, but Jesus Bar-Rabban!" and Pilate was obliged to release him.

His embarrassment increased. He feared that too much indulgence to a prisoner who bore the title "King of the Jews" might compromise him. Fanaticism, too, constrains all powers to make terms with it. Pilate felt himself obliged to yield something; but, still hesitating to shed blood for the satisfaction of men whom he detested, he wished to turn the thing into a jest. Affecting to laugh at the pompous title given to Jesus, he caused him to be scourged.[6] Flagellation was the usual preliminary of crucifixion.[7] Perhaps Pilate wished it to be believed that this sentence had

[1] Matt. xxvii. 20; Mark xv. 11.

[2] The name "Jesus" has disappeared in most manuscripts, but the reading has strong authority in its favour.

[3] Matt. xxvii. 16; Gospel of Hebrews (Hilgenfeld, 17, 28).

[4] Compare Jerome on Matt. xxvii. 16.

[5] Mark xv. 7; Luke xxiii. 19. The Fourth Gospel, which makes him a "robber," seems less well-informed than Mark.

[6] Matt. xxvii. 26; Mark xv. 15; John xix. 1.

[7] Josephus, *Wars*, II. xiv. 9; V. xi. 1; VII. vi. 4. Livy, xxxiii. 36. Quintus Curtius, VII. xi. 28.

already been pronounced, hoping that the preliminary would suffice. Then took place, according to all the accounts, a revolting scene. Some soldiers put a red military cloak on the back of Jesus, a crown of thorny twigs upon his head, and a reed in his hand. Thus attired, he was led to the tribunal in front of the people. The soldiers marched in file before him, buffeting him in turn, and said as they knelt before him, "Hail! King of the Jews!"[1] Others, it is said, spat upon him, and struck his head with the reed. It is difficult to understand that Roman dignity could lend itself to acts so shameful. True, Pilate in the capacity of procurator had scarcely any but auxiliary troops under his command.[2] Roman citizens, as the legionaries were, would not have stooped to such indignities.

Did Pilate think by this display to shield himself from responsibility? Did he hope to turn aside the blow which threatened Jesus by yielding something to the hatred of the Jews,[3] and by substituting for the tragic event a farcical ending, whence it would seem to follow that the affair merited no other issue? If such were his idea, it did not succeed. The tumult increased, and became an actual revolt. The cry "Crucify him! Crucify him!" resounded on all sides. The priests, assuming a tone more and more urgent, declared the law to be in peril if the deceiver were not punished with death.[4] Pilate saw clearly that in order to save Jesus he would have to put down a bloody riot.

[1] Matt. xxvii. 27–30; Mark xv. 16–19; Luke xxiii. 11; John xix. 2, 3.

[2] See Renier, *Inscr. rom. de l'Algérie*, 5, frag. B. Foreign spies and executioners in the army do not appear till later; but see Cicero, *In Verrem*, Act ii., in numerous passages; *Epist. ad Q. Frat.* i. 1, 4.

[3] Luke xxiii. 16, 22.

[4] John xix. 7.

He still tried, however, to gain time. He returned to the judgment-hall, and inquired from what country Jesus came, seeking a pretext to disclaim jurisdiction, — sending Jesus, according to one account, to Antipas, who (it is said) was then at Jerusalem.[1] Jesus did little to help these well-meant efforts; he maintained, as he had done before Caiaphas, a grave and dignified silence, which astonished Pilate. The cries from without became more and more menacing. The people had already begun to denounce the lukewarm zeal of a functionary who shielded an enemy of Cæsar. The greatest adversaries of the Roman rule were found to be transformed into loyal subjects of Tiberius, so as to have the right of accusing the too tolerant procurator of treason. "There is no king here," said they, "but the emperor. Whoever makes himself a king sets himself against the emperor. If the governor lets this man go, he is no friend of Cæsar." [2] The feeble Pilate yielded; he foresaw the report which his enemies would send to Rome, charging him with having favoured a rival of Tiberius. Already, in the matter of the votive shields,[3] the Jews had written to the emperor, and their action

[1] John xix. 9: comp. Luke xxiii. 6-12. This may be a first attempt to "harmonise" the Gospels, Luke having had in his hand an account in which the death of Jesus was wrongly laid to Herod, and, not to lose this point entirely, pieced the two accounts together, — the rather, because he vaguely knew that (as the Fourth Gospel gives it) Jesus appeared before three tribunals. In sundry other cases, Luke seems to have a distant notion of facts peculiar to John's narration. Further, the third Gospel includes in the story of the crucifixion a number of additions which the author seems to have found in a later account, evidently compiled with a view to edification.

[2] John xix. 12, 15: comp. Luke xxiii. 2. How accurately the colouring of this scene is given by the evangelists, may be seen in Philo, *Legatio ad Caium*, 38.

[3] See *ante*, p. 377.

had been approved. He feared for his office. By a weakness which was to hold up his name to the lash of history, he yielded, — throwing upon the Jews, it is said, all the responsibility of what was about to happen. They, according to the Christian story, fully accepted it by exclaiming, "His blood be upon us and on our children!"[1]

Were these words really spoken? It is open to doubt. Still, they are the expression of a profound historical truth. Considering the position of the Roman power in Judæa, Pilate could scarcely have done otherwise than he did. How many sentences of death dictated by religious intolerance have forced the hand of the civil power! The king of Spain, who to please a fanatical clergy delivered hundreds of his subjects to the stake, was more to blame than Pilate; for he held a more absolute power than the Romans had in Jerusalem at this time. When the civil power becomes persecuting or meddlesome, at the solicitation of the priesthood, it gives proof of weakness. But let the government that is without sin in this respect throw the first stone at Pilate. The "secular arm," behind which clerical cruelty shelters itself, is not the guilty one. No one is justified in saying that he has a horror of blood, when he causes it to be shed by his own executioner.

It was, then, neither Tiberius nor Pilate who condemned Jesus: it was the old Jewish party; it was the Mosaic Law. According to our modern ideas, there is no inheritance of guilt from father to son: each must account to human or divine justice only for that which he himself has done. Every Jew who suffers

[1] Matt. xxvii. 24, 25.

to-day for the murder of Jesus has therefore a right to complain; for he might have been a Simon the Cyrenian, or at least not have been one of those who cried "Crucify him!" But nations, like individuals, have their responsibility. If ever a crime was the crime of a nation, it was surely the crucifying of Jesus. His death was "legal," in the sense that it was primarily caused by a law which was the very soul of the nation. The Mosaic Law, in its modern but (no doubt) accepted form, pronounced the penalty of death against every attempt to change the established worship. Now, without doubt, Jesus attacked this worship, and aimed to overthrow it. The Jews expressed this to Pilate, with open and truthful simplicity: "We have a law, and by our law he ought to die; because he made himself the Son of God."[1] The law was detestable, but it was the law of ancient ferocity; and the hero who volunteered to abrogate it had first of all to endure its penalty.

Alas! it would require more than eighteen hundred years for the blood that Jesus shed to bear its fruits. In his name tortures and deaths were to be inflicted for centuries on thinkers as noble as himself. Even to-day, in countries which call themselves Christian, penalties are pronounced for offences purely religious. Jesus is not responsible for these errors. He could not foresee that any people, with imaginations all astray, would one day picture him as a frightful Moloch, greedy of burning flesh. Christianity has been intolerant; but intolerance is not in its essence a Christian quality. It is Jewish, in the sense that it was Judaism which first raised the theory of the absolute in matters of faith, and laid

[1] John xix. 7.

down the principle that every one who turns the people from the true religion, even should he bring miracles in support of his doctrine, is to be met with stones, — stoned to death by anybody and everybody, without form of trial.[1] No doubt the Pagan world also had its religious atrocities; but if it had been under this law, how would it ever have become Christian? The Pentateuch was thus the first code of religious terror. Judaism has given the example of an immutable dogma, armed with the sword. If, instead of pursuing the Jews with blind hatred, Christianity had abolished the order of things which killed its founder, how much more consistent would it have been! how much better would it have deserved of the human race!

[1] Deut. xiii. 1–11.

CHAPTER XXV.

THE CRUCIFIXION.

Although the real motive for the death of Jesus was wholly religious, his enemies had succeeded, in the judgment-hall, in representing him as guilty of treason against the State: they could not have obtained from the sceptic Pilate a condemnation on the ground of heterodoxy. Following up this idea, the priests, through the mob, demanded his crucifixion. This mode of punishment was not of Jewish origin. If his condemnation had been purely Mosaic, he would have been stoned.[1] Crucifixion was a Roman punishment, reserved for slaves and for cases in which it was wished to add to death the aggravation of ignominy. In suffering it, Jesus received the treatment of highway robbers, brigands, bandits, or those enemies of inferior rank to whom the Romans did not grant the honour of death by the sword.[2] It was the chimerical "King of the Jews," not the heterodox dogmatist, who was punished. In keeping with this idea, the execution was left to the

[1] Josephus, *Antiq.* XX. ix. 1. The Talmud, representing his condemnation to be wholly on religious grounds, asserts that he was really condemned to be stoned, but goes on to say that he was hanged, — meaning, perhaps, that he was hanged after being stoned, as was sometimes done (Mishna, *Sanhedrin*, vi. 4: comp. Deut. xxi. 22). Jerusalem Talmud, *Sanhedrin*, xiv. 16; Babylonian Talmud, *ibid.* 43 *a*, 67 *c*.

[2] Josephus, *Antiq.* XVII. x. 10 and XX. vi. 2; *Wars*, V. xi. 1. Apuleius, *Metam.* iii. 9. Suet. *Galba*, 9. Lampridas, *Alex. Severus*, 23.

Romans. Among the Romans at this time the soldiers filled the office of executioners, at least in cases of political offence.[1] Jesus was therefore delivered to a military guard commanded by a centurion,[2] and all the hateful details of the execution, introduced by the cruel customs of the new conquerors, were inflicted upon him. It was about noon.[3] They clad him again in the garments that had been removed for the mocking display of the tribunal; and as the guard had already in reserve two thieves who were to be executed, the three convicts were placed together, and the procession set out for the place of execution.

This was a locality called Golgotha, situated outside Jerusalem, but near the walls of the city.[4] The name "Golgotha" signifies *a skull;* it seems to correspond to our word *Chaumont*, and probably designated a bare eminence, in form like a bald skull. Where this was situated is not exactly known. Certainly it was on the north or northwest of the city, on the high uneven plain which extends between the walls and the two valleys of Kedron and Hinnom,[5] — a region quite commonplace, and rendered still more dreary by the offensive features of the neighbourhood of a great city.

[1] Tacitus, *Ann.* iii. 14 (see *ante*, p. 381, note 2).

[2] Matt. xxvii. 54; Mark xv. 39, 44, 45; Luke xxiii. 47.

[3] John xix. 14. According to Mark (xv. 25), it could hardly have been later than eight, since he was crucified at nine ("the third hour").

[4] Matt. xxvii. 33; Mark xv. 22; John xix. 20; Heb. xiii. 12: comp. Plautus, *Miles Gloriosus*, II. iv. 6, 7.

[5] *Golgotha* seems to have some relation with the hill *Gareb* and the spot called *Goath* (Jerem. xxxi. 39), which were apparently on the northwest of the city. We may conjecturally fix the place near the extreme angle made by the present wall towards the west, or else on one of the hillsides looking down upon the valley of Hinnom, above *Birket Mamilla* [near which is "Gordon's Calvary": see Pierre Loti's *Jerusalem*, p. 102]. Or we might have in mind the eminence overlooking "Jeremiah's Grotto."

There is no good reason to identify Golgotha with the spot which since Constantine has been venerated by all Christendom;[1] but there is no sufficient ground, as to this, to disturb any venerated associations.[2]

The victim condemned to the cross was compelled

[1] The arguments which aim to show that the Holy Sepulchre has been removed since Constantine are without weight.

[2] The question turns on whether the place now known as Golgotha (which is well within the present limits of the city) was at the time of Jesus outside the walls. About eighty yards to the east of the traditional location of Calvary, there has been found the face of a Jewish wall like that of Hebron; and this, if it belonged to the city wall of that date, would leave the site referred to quite outside the town (Vogüe, *Le Temple* etc. p. 117). A burial-cavern (called "tomb of Joseph of Arimathea"), under the wall of the cupola of the "Holy Sepulchre," seems to show that at some period this spot was outside the walls (see, however, Mishna, *Parah*, iii. 2; *Baba kama*, vii. end); but this cavern does not seem old enough (see Vogüe, p. 115) to allow us to suppose it earlier than the line of wall existing in the time of Jesus. Two historical considerations, one of them having some weight, may further be called to the support of the traditional view: 1. First, it would be strange if those who, under Constantine, sought to fix the gospel topography, had not been checked by the objection found in John xix. 20 ("nigh the city") and Heb. xiii. 12 ("without the gate"). How, left free in their choice, should they have lightly incurred so grave a difficulty? We are thus led to think that these devout topographers had some solid ground; that they sought for proofs, and, though not wholly on their guard against pious frauds, they were guided by real tokens: if they had followed a mere vain caprice, they would have fixed Golgotha upon some more evident spot, — the top of some one of the round hillocks near Jerusalem, yielding thus to the Christian fancy, which would have it that the death of the Christ took place upon a mountain. 2. The second consideration favouring the tradition is, that at the time of Constantine a temple of Venus built (it is said) by Hadrian upon Golgotha — or at least the memory of this temple — might serve as a guide. This, however, is far from proof. Eusebius (*Vita Const.* iii. 26), Socrates (*H. E.* i. 17), Sozomen (*H. E.* ii. 1), and Jerome (*Ep.* xlix., *ad Paulinum*) say, it is true, that there was a shrine of Venus on the spot which they identify with the Holy Sepulchre; but it is not certain (1) that it was built by Hadrian; (2) that it was built on a spot called at that day Golgotha; or (3) that he had the intention of building it at the place where Jesus suffered death.

himself to carry the instrument of his execution.[1] But Jesus, physically weaker than his fellow-victims, was not able to carry his. The troop met a certain Simon of Cyrene, returning from the country; and the soldiers, with the rough procedure of foreign garrisons, compelled him to carry the fatal tree. In so doing they perhaps exercised a recognised right of forced labour, since Romans might not carry the accursed wood. It seems that Simon was afterwards of the Christian community; and his two sons, Alexander and Rufus,[2] were well known in it. He related, perhaps, more than one circumstance of which he had been witness. No disciple was at this moment near Jesus.[3]

When arrived at the place of execution, the victims were offered, according to Jewish usage, a strong aromatic wine, — a narcotic drink which, from a feeling of pity, was given to the condemned to stupefy him.[4] It appears that the women of Jerusalem often brought this kind of wine for the dying to the unfortunates who were being led to execution: when there was none thus presented, it was purchased at the expense of the public treasury.[5] Jesus, after having touched the rim of the cup with his lips, refused to drink.[6] This sad

[1] Plutarch, *De sera Numinis vindicta*, 19; Artemidorus, *Onirocrit*, ii. 56.

[2] Mark xv. 21.

[3] The circumstance told in Luke xxiii. 27–31 is one of those in which we note the effect of pious and tender tradition. The words here ascribed to Jesus ["Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for me," etc.], could not have been regarded as his till after the siege of Jerusalem.

[4] Babylonian Talmud, *Sanhedrin*, 3 *a*; Nicolas de Lire, *In Matt.* xxvii. 34: comp. Prov. xxxi. 6.

[5] Babylonian Talmud, *ibid.*

[6] Mark xv. 23 ("wine mingled with myrrh"), contradicted by Matt. xxvii. 34, where the "vinegar and gall" are a messianic allusion to Psalm lxix. 22.

consolation of common sufferers did not accord with his exalted nature. He preferred to quit life with perfect clearness of mind, and to await in full consciousness the death he had willed and brought upon himself. He was then divested of his garments,[1] and fastened to the cross. The cross was composed of two beams, tied in the form of the letter T.[2] It was so little raised that the feet of the condemned almost touched the earth.[3] They began by setting it up;[4] they next fastened the sufferer to it by driving nails into his hands; the feet, though often nailed, were sometimes only bound with cords.[5] A piece of wood was fastened like a spar to the shaft of the cross, at half-height, passing between the legs of the condemned, who rested on it.[6] Without this the hands would have been torn, and the body would have sunk down.[7] At other times a small horizontal rest was fixed at the height of the feet, and supported them.[8]

Jesus experienced these horrors in all their atrocity.

[1] Matt. xxvii. 35; Mark xv. 24; John xix. 23 (comp. Artemidorus, *Onirocritica*, ii. 53).

[2] Epistle of Barnabas, 9; Lucian, *Jud. voc.* 12: compare the grotesque form of cross scrawled at Rome on a wall of Mt. Palatine (Garrucci: *Il crocifisso graffito in casa dei Cesari*, Roma, 1857).

[3] As we see from the "hyssop" of John xix. 29: with a sprig of hyssop one cannot reach very high. (True, this may be an allusion to Exod. xii. 22.)

[4] Josephus, *Wars*, VII. vi. 4; Cicero, *In Verr.* v. 66; Xenophon of Ephesus, *Ephesiaca*, iv. 2.

[5] Luke xxiv. 39; John xx. 25–27; Plautus, *Most.* II. i. 13; Lucan, *Pharsalia*, vi. 543–547; Justin, *Tryph.* 97; *Apol.* i. 35; Tertullian, *Adv. Marcionem*, iii. 19.

[6] Irenæus, *Adv. hær.* II. xxiv. 4; Justin, *Tryph.* 91.

[7] See story by an eyewitness of a crucifixion in China: *Revue germanique et française*, Aug. 1864, p. 358.

[8] See the *graffito* before cited, and monuments in Martigny, *Dict. des antiq. chr.* 193; also Gregory of Tours, *De gloria mart.* i. 6.

The two robbers were crucified, one on each side of him. The executioners, to whom were usually left the small effects of the victims,[1] drew lots for his garments,[2] and watched him, sitting at the foot of the cross.[3] According to one tradition, Jesus uttered this sentence, which was in his heart if not upon his lips: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."[4]

According to the Roman custom, a writing was affixed to the head of the cross,[5] bearing in three languages — Hebrew, Greek, and Latin — the words: "THE KING OF THE JEWS." There was in this inscription something scornful and insulting to the nation. The numerous passers-by who read it were offended. The priests complained to Pilate that he ought to have made use of an inscription which implied simply that Jesus had called himself "King of the Jews." But Pilate, already tired of the affair, refused to make any change in what had been written.[6]

All the disciples had fled. One tradition, however,[7]

[1] Digest, xlvii. 20, *De bonis damnatorum*, 6. The custom was checked by Hadrian.

[2] Matt. xxvii. 35; Mark xv. 24; Luke xxiii. 34. The circumstance [of the coat "without seam"] added in John xix. 23, 24, seems to be a fancy: see Josephus, *Antiq.* III. vii. 4.

[3] Matt. xxvii. 36: comp. Petronius, *Satyr.* 111, 112.

[4] Luke xxiii. 34. In general, the last words ascribed to Jesus, especially in Luke, suggest a desire either of edification or the fulfilment of prophecy. In such cases, each one hears as he feels; and the last words of celebrated men are always variously reported by the nearest witnesses, — as in the case of the Bâb (Gobineau, *Les religions et les philosophies de l'Asie centrale*, 268).

[5] This was probably carried before Jesus on the way to Calvary. See Sueton., *Calig.* 32; Euseb. *Hist.* V. i. 19 (Letter of churches of Vienne and Lyons).

[6] Matt. xxvii. 37; Mark xv. 26; Luke xxiii. 38; John xix. 19–22. Perhaps there was a scruple of legality: Apuleius, *Florida*, i. 9.

[7] Justin, *Tryph.* 106.

declares John to have remained standing at the foot of the cross during the whole time.[1] It may be affirmed, with more certainty, that the devoted women of Galilee, who had followed Jesus to Jerusalem and continued to attend him, did not abandon him. Mary Cleophas, Mary of Magdala, Joanna wife of Khouza, Salome, and others, stood off at a certain distance,[2] never losing sight of him.[3] If we may believe the fourth evangelist,[4] Mary the mother of Jesus was also at the foot of the cross; and Jesus, seeing his mother and his beloved disciple together, said to him, "Behold thy mother!" and to her, "Behold thy son!"[5] But we do not understand how the Synoptics, who name the other women, should have omitted her whose

[1] John xix. 25–27.

[2] The Synoptics all put the faithful group "far" from the cross; the Fourth Gospel says "beside" (*παρά*), to indicate that John himself was very near.

[3] Matt. xxvii. 55, 56; Mark xv. 40, 41; Luke xxiii. 49, 55, and xxiv. 10; John xix. 25: comp. Luke xxiii. 27–31.

[4] John xix. 25–27. Luke, who is always on middle ground between the other two Gospels and the fourth, introduces "all his acquaintance" (xxiii. 49), but "afar off." The expression (*γνωστοί*) may, it is true, include the "kindred;" but Luke (ii. 44) distinguishes between "kinsfolk" (*συγγενεῖς*) and "acquaintance" (*γνωστοί*). Further, the best manuscripts read *οἱ γνωστοὶ αὐτῷ* ("known to him"), not *οἱ γνωστοὶ αὐτοῦ* ("his acquaintance"). Mary the mother of Jesus is by Luke (in Acts i. 14) put in company with the Galilean women; elsewhere (Luke ii. 35) he says that a sword will pierce her heart. But this is far from explaining why he omits her at the cross.

[5] John seems, in fact, after the death of Jesus, to have taken home the mother of his master, and to have, as it were, adopted her (John xix. 27). The great honour in which she was held by the infant Church very probably led the disciples of John to maintain that Jesus, whose favourite disciple their master had been, had in dying commended to him that which he held most dear. The presence with him, whether real or supposed, of this precious charge gave him a certain eminence among the Apostles, and secured high authority to the doctrine of which he was made the sponsor.

presence was so striking a feature. It is even possible that the supremely lofty character of Jesus renders such personal emotion hardly probable, at a moment when, with thoughts engrossed wholly by his work, he no longer existed except for humanity.

Apart from this small group of women, the sight of whom consoled him from afar, Jesus had before him only the spectacle of human baseness or stupidity. The passers-by insulted him. He heard around him foolish scoffs, and his dying cries of pain were turned into odious jests: "There he is, who called himself the Son of God! Let his Father, if he will, deliver him now!" "He saved others," they said again; "he cannot save himself. If he is the King of Israel, let him come down from the cross, and we will believe on him!" "Ah," said another, "you that destroy the Temple, and build it again in three days, come, save yourself!"[1] Some, vaguely acquainted with his apocalyptic ideas, thought they heard him call Elijah, and said, "Let us see whether Elijah will come to save him." It appears that the two crucified thieves at his side also mocked him.[2] The sky was dark;[3] and the land, as in all the environs of Jerusalem, arid and dreary. For a moment, as some relate, the heart of Jesus failed him: a cloud hid from him the face of his Father; he experienced an agony of despair a thousand times more piercing than all his tortures. He saw only the ingratitude of men. In reaction, perhaps, from the suffering he endured for a worthless race, he exclaimed: "My God, my God!

[1] Matt. xxvii. 40–43; Mark xv. 29–32.

[2] Matt. xxvii. 44; Mark xv. 32. Luke modifies the account, in harmony with his zeal for the conversion of sinners.

[3] Matt. xxvii. 45; Mark xv. 33; Luke xxiii. 44.

why hast thou forsaken me?" But the divine spirit in him still gained the victory. In proportion as the life of the body flickered, his soul became clear, returning by degrees to its celestial origin. He found again the true feeling of his mission; he saw in his own death the salvation of the world; he lost sight of the hideous spectacle spread at his feet; and, profoundly one with his Father, he entered, though on the cross, into the divine life, whereby he should abide in the heart of man through ages without end.

The peculiar atrocity of crucifixion was that one could live three or four days in this horrible state upon the instrument of torture.[1] The bleeding from the hands soon stopped, and was not fatal. The real cause of death was the unnatural position of the body, which brought on a frightful disturbance of the circulation, terrible pains in the head and heart, and, finally, cramping of the limbs. Victims of strong constitution could even sleep, and would die simply of hunger.[2] The original idea of this cruel punishment was not directly to kill the culprit by special lacerations, but to expose the slave, nailed by the hands of which he had made ill use, and to let him perish on the wood. The finer organisation of Jesus preserved him from this slow agony. A burning thirst consumed him, — one of the tortures of crucifixion, as of all injuries which cause great loss of blood.[3] He asked to drink. Near him there was a cup full of the ordinary drink of the Roman soldiers, a mixture of vinegar and water, called *posca*.

[1] Petronius, *Satyr.* cxi. *et seq.*; Origen, *Comm. in Matt.* ser. 140: Arabic text in Kosegarten, *Chrest. arab.* p. 63 *et seq.*; *Revue germ.*, ubi supra.

[2] Eusebius, *Hist.* viii. 8; *Revue germ.* ibid.

[3] See the Arabic text before referred to.

The soldiers had to carry with them their *posca* on all their expeditions, among which executions were reckoned.[1] A soldier dipped a sponge[2] in this mixture, put it on the end of a reed, and raised it to the lips of Jesus, who sucked it.[3] It is the opinion in the East, that giving drink to those crucified or impaled hastens death:[4] many thought[5] that he expired as soon as he had tasted the vinegar and water. It is, however, more probable that an apoplexy, or the instantaneous rupture of a vessel near the heart, brought him a sudden death at the end of three hours. A few moments before expiring, his voice was still strong.[6] All at once he uttered a terrible cry, which some heard as, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit!" but which others, more intent on the fulfilment of prophecies, rendered, "It is finished!" His head fell upon his breast, and he breathed his last.

Rest now in thy glory, noble Founder! Thy work is completed; thy divinity is established. Fear no more to see the edifice of thy efforts crumble through any fault! Henceforth, beyond all frailty, thou shalt aid from the depth of thy divine peace the unending results that follow from thy deeds. At the cost of a few hours of suffering, which have not even touched thy great soul, thou hast achieved immortality the most complete. During thousands of years, the world will breathe life from

[1] Spartian, *Vita Adriani;* Vulcatius Gallicanus, *Avidius Cassius*, 5.

[2] Probably the small sponge which served as a stopper to the neck of the vessel containing the *posca*.

[3] Matt. xxvii. 48; Mark xv. 36; Luke xxiii. 36; John xix. 28–30.

[4] See Nicolas de Lire, *In Matt.* xxvii. 34 and John xix. 29; also the accounts of the execution of Kléber's assassin. Compare *Rev. germ.*, etc.

[5] See Matt., Mark, and John.

[6] Matt. xxvii. 46; Mark xv. 34.

thee. Around thee, as an ensign lifted above our conflicts, will be fought the hottest battle. A thousand times more living, more beloved, since thy death than during the days of thy pilgrimage here below, thou wilt become so completely the corner-stone of humanity, that to tear thy name from the record of this world would be to disturb its very foundations. Henceforth men shall draw no boundary between thee and God. Do thou, who hast completely vanquished death, take possession of thy kingdom, whither, by the royal road thou hast pointed out, long generations of adorers shall follow thee!

CHAPTER XXVI.

THE SEPULCHRE.

It was about three in the afternoon, by our reckoning, when Jesus expired.[1] A Jewish law forbade a corpse to be left suspended "upon the tree" beyond the evening of the day of execution.[2] It is hardly probable that in the executions performed by the Romans this rule was observed; but as the next day was the Sabbath, and a Sabbath of peculiar solemnity, the Jews expressed to the Roman authorities[3] their desire that this holy day should not be profaned by such a spectacle.[4] Their request was granted; orders were given to hasten the death of the three who had suffered, and to remove them from the cross. The soldiers executed this order by applying to the two thieves a second infliction much more speedy than that of the cross, — breaking of the legs[5] (*crurifragium*), a common punishment of slaves and prisoners of war. As to Jesus, they found him

[1] Matt. xxvii. 46; Mark xv. 37; Luke xxiii. 44: comp. John xix. 14.

[2] Deut. xxi. 22, 23; Joshua viii. 29 and x. 26, 27: comp. Josephus, *Wars*, IV. v. 2; Mishna, *Sanhedrin*, vi. 5.

[3] In the Fourth Gospel, "to Pilate;" but this cannot be, for Mark (xv. 44, 45) states that "when the even was come" Pilate was still ignorant of the death of Jesus.

[4] Comp. Philo, *In Flaccum*, 10.

[5] There is no other example of *crurifragium* following crucifixion, though a "stroke of grace" was often given to shorten the suffering. See a passage translated from Ibn-Hischâm in the *Zeitschr. für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, i. 99, 100.

dead, and did not think it necessary to break his legs.[1] But one of them, to remove all doubt as to the real death of the third victim, and to complete it if any breath remained in him, pierced his side with a spear.[2] They thought they saw water and blood flow,[3] which was regarded as a sign of the cessation of life.

The fourth evangelist, who here represents the Apostle John as having been an eye-witness, insists strongly on this detail.[4] It is evident, in fact, that doubts arose as to the reality of the death of Jesus. A few hours of suspension on the cross appeared to those accustomed to see crucifixions entirely insufficient to bring about such a result. They cited many instances of persons crucified, who had been removed in time, and brought to life again by energetic treatment.[5] Origen, later on, thought it needful to invoke miracle in order to explain so sudden an end.[6] The same surprise is discovered in the narrative of Mark.[7] To speak truly, the best assurance the historian has upon a point of this nature is the suspicious hatred of the enemies of Jesus. It is very doubtful whether the Jews at that time felt any suspicion that Jesus might be thought to have revived; but, in any case, they must have made sure that he was really dead. However negligent the ancients may have been, at certain periods, in all that concerned

[1] This is, possibly, an addition inserted to liken Jesus to the paschal lamb; Exodus xii. 46; Numbers ix. 12.

[2] Perhaps a similar parallel with Zechariah xii. 10: comp. John xix. 37; Rev. i. 7.

[3] Here, again, we may suspect an *a-priori* symbolism: comp. 1 John v. 6–8; Apollinaris in the *Chronique Pascale*, p. 7.

[4] John xix. 34, 35.

[5] Herodotus, vii. 194; Josephus, *Life*, 75.

[6] *In Matt. Commen. series*, 140.

[7] Mark xv. 44, 45.

legal precision and the strict conduct of affairs, we cannot but believe that for this once those interested had taken some precautions in this matter on a point so important to them.[1]

According to the Roman custom, the body of Jesus should have remained suspended in order to become the prey of birds.[2] According to the Jewish law, it would have been taken away by night and deposited in the place of infamy set apart for the burial of executed criminals.[3] If his disciples had been only poor Galileans, timid and without influence, the second course would have been adopted; but we have seen that in spite of his small success at Jerusalem Jesus had gained the sympathy of some persons of consideration, who were looking for the kingdom of God, and without avowing themselves his disciples were deeply attached to him. One of these, Joseph, of the small town of Arimathea (*Ha-ramathaïm*),[4] went in the evening to ask the body from the procurator.[5] Joseph was a rich man, honourable, and a member of the Sanhedrim. Besides, the Roman law at this time required the delivering up of the body of an executed person to any who claimed it.[6] Pilate, who was ignorant of the circumstance of the *crurifragium*, was astonished that Jesus was so soon

[1] The exigencies of their argument led the Christians afterwards to exaggerate these precautions, especially when the Jews had adopted the course of insisting that the body of Jesus had been stolen. See Matt. xxvii. 62–66; xxviii. 11–15.

[2] Horace, *Ep.* I. xvi. 48; Juvenal, xiv. 77; Lucan, vi. 544; Plautus, *Miles*, II. iv. 19; Artemidorus, *Onir.* ii. 53; Pliny, xxxvi. 24; Plutarch, *Cleomenes*, 39; Petronius, *Sat.* 111, 112.

[3] Mishna, *Sanhedrin*, vi. 5, 6.

[4] Probably the ancient *Ramah* of Samuel, in the tribe of Ephraim.

[5] Matt. xxvii. 57, 58; Mark xv. 42–45; Luke xxiii. 50–53; John xix. 38.

[6] Digest, xlviii. 24, *De cadaveribus punitorum.*

dead, and summoned the centurion who had directed the execution to know how this was. Having received his assurance, Pilate granted to Joseph the object of his request. The body probably had already been taken from the cross; it was now delivered to Joseph, that he might do with it as he pleased.

Another secret friend, Nicodemus,[1] whom we have already seen employing his influence in favour of Jesus, came forward at this moment. He arrived, bearing an ample provision of materials required for the embalming. Joseph and Nicodemus buried Jesus according to the Jewish custom, — that is to say, they wrapped him in a sheet with myrrh and aloes. The Galilean women were present,[2] and no doubt accompanied the scene with piercing cries and tears.

It was late, and all this was done in great haste. The place had not yet been chosen where the body would be finally deposited. The conveying of it, besides, might have delayed them to a late hour, and thus involved a violation of the Sabbath; while the disciples still scrupulously observed the precepts of the Jewish law. Hence a temporary interment was decided upon.[3] There was near at hand, in the garden, a tomb recently dug out in the rock, — belonging, probably, to one of the brotherhood,[4] — which had never been used. The funeral caves, when destined for a single body, were composed of a small cell, at the bottom of which the place for the body was marked by a trough (or bed)

[1] John xix. 39–42.

[2] Matt. xxvii. 61; Mark xv. 47; Luke xxiii. 55.

[3] John xix. 41, 42.

[4] A tradition (Matt. xxvii. 60) denotes Joseph of Arimathea as himself the owner of the tomb.

hollowed in the floor and roofed with an arch.[1] As these caves were dug out of the sides of sloping rocks, they were entered on the same level, and the door was shut by a stone very difficult to handle. The body was laid in the cave,[2] and the stone was rolled to the door, the intention being to return in order to make the burial more complete; but, as the next day was a solemn Sabbath, the task was deferred till the day following.[3]

The women withdrew, after having carefully noticed how the body was laid. They employed the evening hours which remained to them in making further preparations for the embalming. On the Saturday all rested.[4]

On the Sunday morning the women, Mary of Magdala before the others, came very early to the tomb.[5] The stone was displaced from the opening, and the body was no longer in the place where it had been put. And now the strangest rumours went abroad in the Christian community. The cry, "He is risen!" spread among the disciples like a flash of light. Love caused it to find ready credence everywhere.

What had taken place? In treating the history of

[1] The cave supposed in the time of Constantine to be the tomb of Christ had this form, as may be inferred from the description of Arculphus (in Mabilion, *Acta SS. Ord. S. Bened.* III. ii. 504), and from the vague traditions preserved at Jerusalem among the Greek clergy on the condition of the rock now hidden by the chapel of the Holy Sepulchre. But the proofs of identification relied on, under Constantine, were feeble or void (see especially Sozomen, *H. E.* ii. 1). Even admitting the site of Golgotha to be nearly accurate, the Holy Sepulchre would have no serious claim to be authentic. In any case, the aspect of the locality is completely changed.

[2] Cor. xv. 4.

[3] Luke xxiii. 56.

[4] Luke xxiii. 54–56.

[5] Matt. xxviii. 1; Mark xvi 1; Luke xxiv. 1; John xx. 1.

the Apostles we shall have to examine this point, and to investigate the origin of the legends touching the resurrection. For the historian, the life of Jesus finishes with his last sigh; but such was the impression he had left in the hearts of his disciples and of a few devoted women, that for some weeks longer he was for them a living comforter. Who had taken away his body?[1] Under what conditions did enthusiasm, always credulous, create the group of narratives by which faith in the resurrection was established? In the absence of opposing testimony we shall never know. Let us say, however, that the vivid imagination of Mary Magdalen[2] played in this circumstance an essential part.[3] Divine power of love! Sacred moments, in which the illusion of an impassioned woman gave to the world a deity risen from the grave!

[1] See Matt. xxviii. 15; John xx. 2.

[2] She had been possessed by "seven demons": Mark xvi. 9; Luke viii 2.

[3] This is evident chiefly in the sixteenth chapter of Mark, verses 9–11, and so on to the end, making a conclusion quite independent of the original ending of this Gospel at verse 8. (See MS. *B* of the Vatican, and the Sinaitic codex.) In the Fourth Gospel (xx. 1, 2, 11, 12, 18) Mary of Magdala is also the first and solitary witness of the resurrection.

CHAPTER XXVII.

FATE OF HIS ENEMIES.

According to our reckoning, the death of Jesus took place in the year 33 A. D.[1] It cannot, at all events, have been either earlier than 29, — the preaching of John and Jesus having begun in the year preceding,[2] — or later than 35, as in the year following, probably before the Passover, Pilate and Caiaphas both lost their offices.[3] The death of Jesus, however, had no connection whatever with these two removals.[4] In his retirement, Pilate probably never thought for a moment of the forgotten episode which was to transmit his sombre fame to the most distant posterity. As to Caiaphas, he was succeeded by Jonathan, his brother-in-law, son of the same Hanan who had played the principal part in the trial of Jesus. The Sadducean family of Hanan retained the pontificate a long time, and, more powerful than ever, continued to wage against the disciples and the family of Jesus the implacable war which they had

[1] The year 33 corresponds well with one of the data of the problem; namely, that the 14th of Nisan was Friday. If we reject this date, we must, to find another which fills this condition, go back to 29 or forward to 36 (see *ante*, p. 354, note 7).

[2] Luke iii. 1.

[3] Josephus, *Antiq.* XVIII. iv. 2, 3.

[4] The assertion to the contrary, made by Tertullian and Eusebius, rests on an apocryphal or a worthless legend (see Philo. *Cod. apocr. N. T.* p. 813 *et seq.*). The suicide of Pilate (Euseb. *Hist.* ii. 7; *Chron.* ad Ann. 1 Caii) seems also to be legendary (Tischendorf, *Evang. apocr.* p. 432 *et seq.*).

entered upon against himself. Christianity, which owed to him the definitive act of its foundation, owed to him also its first martyrs. Hanan was looked upon as one of the most fortunate men of his time.[1] The man really guilty of the death of Jesus ended his life at the summit of honours and consideration, never doubting for an instant that he had rendered a great service to the nation. His sons continued to rule about the Temple, with difficulty held in check by the procurators, whose consent they would often not even ask in gratifying their haughty and violent instincts.[2]

Antipas and Herodias also quickly disappeared from the political stage. When Herod Agrippa was raised to the dignity of king by Caligula, the jealous Herodias swore that she too would be queen. Pressed incessantly by this ambitious woman, who treated him as a coward because he suffered a superior in his family, Antipas overcame his natural indolence, and went to Rome to solicit the title which his nephew had just obtained (39 A. D.). But the affair turned out extremely ill. Damaged in the emperor's esteem by Herod Agrippa, Antipas was deposed, and dragged out the rest of his life in exile here or there, at Lyons and in Spain. Herodias followed him in his downfall.[3] A hundred years, at least, were to elapse before the name of their obscure subject (who had become a divinity) should appear in these remote countries, to recall upon their tombs the murder of John the Baptist.

As to the wretched Judas of Kerioth, terrible legends were current about his death. It was asserted that he

[1] Josephus, *Antiq.* XX. ix. 1.

[2] Josephus, ibid.; Tosiphta *Menachoth*, ii.

[3] Josephus, *Antiq.* XVIII. vii. 1, 2; *Wars*, II. ix. 6.

had bought a field near Jerusalem with the price of his perfidy. There was, indeed, to the south of Mount Zion a place named *Hakeldama* (the field of blood),[1] which was supposed to be the property acquired by the traitor.[2] According to one tradition, he killed himself;[3] according to another, he had a fall in his field, causing a rupture, of which he died.[4] According to others, he died of a kind of dropsy, accompanied by repulsive circumstances which were regarded as a chastisement by Heaven.[5] The desire to make out Judas to be a parallel to Ahithophel,[6] and of showing in him the accomplishment of the menaces which the Psalmist pronounces against the treacherous friend,[7] may have given rise to these legends. Perhaps, in the retirement of his field of Hakeldama, Judas led a quiet and obscure life; while his former friends prepared the conquest of the world, and spread abroad the report of his infamy. Perhaps, also, the terrible hatred which weighed on his head drove him to violent acts, in which men saw the finger of Heaven.

The time of the great Christian revenge was, however, far distant. The new sect had no hand in the ca-

[1] Jerome, *De situ*, etc., under the word "Acheldama." Eusebius (ibid.) says on the north; but the itineraries support Jerome. The tradition which gives this name to the burial-ground in the valley of Hinnom goes back as far as to the time of Constantine.

[2] Acts i. 18, 19. Matthew (or his interpolator) has given the less satisfactory form of the tradition, connecting with it the circumstance of the strangers' burial-place close by, and finding in it an imaginary verification of Zech. xi. 12, 13.

[3] Matt. xxvii. 5.

[4] Acts i. 18, 19. Papias, in Œcumenius, *Ennarr. in Act. Apost.* ii. and in F. Münter, *Fragm. Patr. græc.* (Hafn, 1788), fasc. i. 17 *et seq.*; Theophylact, *In Matt.* xxvii. 5.

[5] Papias (in Münter) and Theophylact, as above.

[6] 2 Sam. xvii. 23.

[7] Psalms lxix. and cix.

tastrophe which Judaism was soon to experience. The synagogue did not understand till long after to what it exposed itself in enforcing laws of intolerance. The Empire was certainly still further from suspecting that its future destroyer had been born. For nearly three hundred years it pursued its path without suspecting that by its side principles were growing which would subject humanity to a complete transformation. At once theocratic and democratic, the idea cast forth by Jesus into the world was, together with the invasion of northern tribes, the most active cause of dissolution to the work of the Cæsars. On the one hand, the right of all men to share in the kingdom of God was proclaimed. On the other, religion was henceforth separated in principle from the State. The rights of conscience, unprotected by political law, resulted in creating a new power, — the "spiritual power." This power has more than once belied its origin. For ages bishops have been princes, and the Pope has been a king. What claims to be an empire of souls has shown itself again and again as a frightful tyranny, employing torture and the stake to maintain itself. But the day will come when the separation will bear its fruits; when the domain of things spiritual will cease to call itself a "power," and will claim to be a "liberty." Proceeding from the bold affirmation of a man of the people, ushered into life in full view of the people, beloved and admired first of all by the people, Christianity was stamped by an original character which will never be effaced. It was the first triumph of the Revolution, the victory of popular sentiment, the advent of the simple in heart, the inauguration of what the common people can apprehend as right and true. Jesus thus opened that

breach in the aristocratic societies of antiquity through which all privilege must pass away.

The civil power, in fact, though innocent of the death of Jesus (it only countersigned the sentence, and that against its will), had to bear its heavy responsibility. In presiding at the scene of Calvary, the State gave itself the most deadly blow. A legend prevailed and became known to everybody, irreverent to every higher power, — a legend in which the constituted authorities play a hateful part, where the accused is in the right, while the judges and guardians of the peace are leagued against the truth. The story of the Passion, spread by innumerable popular images, and to the last degree seditious, represents the Roman eagles as sanctioning the most unjust of executions, soldiers as the executioners, and a provincial governor as lending it his authority. What a blow for all established powers! They have never fully recovered from it. How can they assume an air of infallibility towards the ignorant and weak, when they have on their conscience the monstrous blunder of Gethsemane?[1]

[1] This popular feeling was still alive in Brittany when I was a child. The armed police was there regarded — as the Jew was elsewhere — with a certain pious repugnance; for that was the power which arrested Jesus!

CHAPTER XXVIII.

HIS WORK.

Jesus, as we see, never extended his action beyond the circle of Judaism. Though his sympathy for all outcasts of orthodoxy led him to admit Pagans into the kingdom of God, — though he had more than once resided on pagan soil, and though once or twice we surprise him in kindly relations with unbelievers,[1] — it may be said that his life was passed entirely in the small and very restricted world in which he was born. In Greek or Roman countries he was never heard of; his name appears in profane authors not till a hundred years later, and then indirectly, in connection with seditious movements provoked by his doctrine, or persecutions suffered by his disciples.[2] Even within the sphere of Judaism Jesus made no very durable impression. Philo, who died about the year 50, never suspected his existence. Josephus, born in the year 37, and writing at the close of the century, mentions his execution in a few lines,[3] as an event of secondary importance; while in the enumeration of the sects of his time he omits the Christians altogether.[4] Justus of Tiberias, an historian of the same period, does not

[1] Matt. viii. 5–10; Luke vii. 1–10; John xii 20–23: comp. Josephus, *Antiq.* XVIII. iii. 3.

[2] Tacitus, *Ann.* xv. 45; Suetonius, *Claudius*, 25.

[3] *Antiq.* XVIII. iii. 3 (the passage is altered by some Christian hand).

[4] *Antiq.* XVIII. i.; *Wars*, II. viii.; *Life*, 2.

mention the name of Jesus.[1] The Mishna, too, affords no trace of the new school. The passages in the two Gemaras in which the founder of Christianity is named were not composed earlier than the fourth or fifth century.[2]

The one essential work of Jesus was to gather round him a circle of disciples, whom he inspired with boundless affection, and in whose hearts he planted the germ of his doctrine. To have made himself beloved, "to the extent that after his death they ceased not to love him," was the great work of Jesus, and that which most struck his contemporaries.[3] His doctrine was a thing so little dogmatic, that he never thought of writing it or of having it written. Men became his disciples not by believing this or that, but by attaching themselves to his person and by loving him. A few sentences gathered from the memory of his hearers, and especially his type of character and the impression he had left, were what remained of him. Jesus is not a founder of dogmas, or a deviser of symbols; he is the world's guide into a new spirit. The least Christian of men were, on the one hand, the doctors of the Greek Church, who, from the fourth century on, entangled Christianity in a labyrinth of puerile metaphysical debates; and, on the other hand, the scholastics of the Latin Middle Age, who sought to draw from the Gospel

[1] Photius, *Bibl.* cod. 33.

[2] Jerusalem Talmud, *Sanhedrin*, xiv. 16; *Aboda zara*, ii. 2; *Schabbath*, xiv. 4. Babylonian Talmud, *Sanh.* 43 *a*, 67 *a*; *Schab.* 104 *b*, 116 *b*: comp. *Chagiga.* 4 *b*; *Gittin*, 57 *a*, 90 *a*. The two Gemaras borrow the greater part of their data respecting Jesus from a burlesque and vulgar legend invented by the enemies of Christianity, without historical value: comp. Origen, *Contra Celsum*, i. 28, 32.

[3] Josephus, *Antiq.* XVIII. iii. 3.

the thousands of articles of a colossal *Summa*. To cling to Jesus, with the kingdom of God in prospect, — this is what at first was called being a Christian.

It will thus be understood how, by an exceptional destiny, pure Christianity still presents itself, after eighteen centuries, in the character of a universal and eternal religion. In truth, the religion of Jesus is, in some respects, the final religion. Christianity was the product of a perfectly spontaneous movement of the human soul. Emancipated at her birth from all dogmatic restraint, she struggled three hundred years for liberty of conscience ; and now, in spite of the failures that have followed, she still reaps the fruits of her illustrious origin. To renew herself, she has only to return to the Gospel. The kingdom of God, as we conceive it, differs utterly from the supernatural apparition which early Christians hoped to see flash out in the clouds ; but the sentiment which Jesus introduced into the world is surely ours. His perfect idealism is the loftiest rule of a pure and virtuous life. He created the heaven of pure souls, where are found what we seek for in vain on earth, — the perfect nobility of the children of God, absolute holiness, complete cleansing from the stains of earth; in a word, liberty, which actual society discards as an impossibility, and which can find its fulness only in the domain of thought. Jesus is still the great Master of those who take refuge in this ideal paradise. He first proclaimed the sovereignty of the mind ; he first said, at least through his acts, "My kingdom is not of this world." The foundation of true religion is verily his work. Since him, it only remains to unfold it and make it fruitful.

"Christianity" has thus become almost synonymous with "religion." All that may be attempted outside this grand and noble Christian tradition will be sterile. Jesus has founded religion in human nature, — just as in human nature Socrates founded philosophy, and Aristotle science. There was philosophy before Socrates, and science before Aristotle; since Socrates and Aristotle, philosophy and science have made immense progress: but it has all been built upon the foundations they laid down. In like manner, religious thought had passed through many revolutions before Jesus; since his day, it has made great conquests: yet we have not advanced, and we never shall advance, beyond the essential principle which he laid down, whereon he has fixed forever the idea of pure worship. The religion of Jesus is not limited. The Church has had her periods and her phases; she has shut herself up in symbols which have lasted and can last only for a time. Jesus, on the other hand, has founded absolute religion, which excludes nothing, prescribes nothing, unless it be the motive. His symbols are not fixed dogmas; they are images susceptible of indefinite interpretations. We should seek in vain for a theological proposition in the Gospel.

All professions of faith are travesties of the idea of Jesus, — very much as the scholastics of the Middle Age, in proclaiming Aristotle as the only master of a completed science, falsified the thought of Aristotle. Aristotle, if he had taken part in the debates of the schools, would have repudiated this narrow doctrine; he would have allied himself with the party of progressive science as against the routine which shielded itself under his authority; he would have applauded

his opponents. Just so if Jesus were to return among us, he would recognise as disciples not those who pretend to embody him in a few phrases of the catechism, but those who labour to complete his work. The eternal glory in all great things is to have laid the first stone. It may be that in modern "Physics" and "Meteorology" we discover not a word of the treatises of Aristotle which bear these titles; but Aristotle remains no less the founder of natural science. Whatever may be the transformations of dogma in religion, Jesus will remain the creator of the pure sentiment: the Sermon on the Mount will never be out of date. No revolution will prevent us from attaching ourselves in religion to the great family of thought and faith at whose head is enshrined the name of Jesus. In this sense we are Christians, even when we separate ourselves on almost every point from the Christian tradition which has preceded us.

And this great foundation was, in truth, the personal work of Jesus. To make himself adored to this degree, he must have been worthy to be adored. Love is kindled only by an object worthy of it: and did we know nothing of Jesus except the passion he inspired in those around him, still we must affirm that he was great and stainless. The faith, the enthusiasm, the constancy of the first Christian generation are to be explained only by assuming, at the beginning of it all, a man of transcendent greatness. In view of the marvellous creations of the ages of faith, two impressions equally fatal to good historical criticism occur to the mind. On the one hand we are led to think of these creations too impersonally: we impute to collective action that which has often been the work of a single

powerful will and controlling mind. On the other hand, we refuse to see men like ourselves in the authors of these extraordinary movements which have determined the fate of humanity. Let us take a broader view of the powers which Nature conceals in her bosom. Our civilisations, governed by minute restrictions, cannot give us any idea of human power in times when each man's originality had a far more open field of development. Let us imagine a recluse, dwelling among the quarries near our great towns, coming out from time to time to present himself at the palaces of sovereigns, brushing the sentinels aside, and, with an imperious tone, announcing to kings the approach of revolutions of which he had been the promoter. The bare idea provokes a smile. Yet such was Elijah: Elijah the Tishbite, in our days, could not pass the wicket-gate of the Tuileries. The preaching of Jesus and his free activity in Galilee are no less inconceivable among the social conditions to which we are accustomed. Released from our polite conventionalities, exempt from the uniform education which refines us but so greatly dwarfs our individuality, these full-grown souls carried a surprising energy into action. They appear to us like the giants of a heroic age which never in reality existed. This is a profound error! These men were our brothers: they were of our stature; they felt and thought as we do. But the breath of God was free in them; with us, it is clamped by the iron bonds of a mean society, and condemned to an incurable commonplace.

Let us place the person of Jesus, then, at the highest summit of human greatness. Let us not be led astray by excessive distrust in the presence of a legend which

keeps us always in a superhuman world. The life of Francis of Assisi is also only a tissue of miracles; but has any one ever doubted his existence, and the part he played? Let us not say that the glory of founding Christianity belongs to the multitude of the first Christians, and not to him whom legend has deified. The inequality of men is far more marked in the East than with us. There it is no rarity to see characters whose greatness amazes us spring up in the midst of ignoble surroundings. So far from Jesus having been made by his disciples, he appears in everything superior to them. They — Saint Paul and perhaps Saint John excepted — were men without invention or genius. Saint Paul himself bears no comparison with Jesus; and as to Saint John, he has done little more in his Apocalypse than to exalt himself with the poetry of Jesus. Hence the immense superiority of the Gospels among the writings of the New Testament. Hence the feeling of a painful descent when we pass from the history of Jesus to that of the Apostles. The evangelists themselves, who have handed down to us the image of Jesus, are so much beneath him of whom they speak that they constantly disfigure him, not being able to reach his height. Their writings are full of errors and contradictions. In every line we have glimpses of an original divinely beautiful, marred by copyists who do not understand it, and who substitute their own ideas for those they only half grasp. In a word, the character of Jesus, far from having been embellished by his biographers, has been belittled by them. Criticism, in order to find him again as he was, needs to put aside a series of misapprehensions due to the feebler minds of the disciples. They painted him as

they conceived him, and often, in thinking to magnify him, they have really made him less.

I know that our modern notions are frequently offended in this legend, conceived by another race, under another sky, and in the midst of other social needs. There are virtues which, in some respects, are better adapted to our taste. The upright and mild-mannered Marcus Aurelius, the humble and kind-hearted Spinoza, not having supposed themselves to be workers of miracles, were exempt from some errors that Jesus shared. Spinoza had, in his profound obscurity, an advantage which Jesus did not seek. By our extreme scruple in employing means of conviction, by our absolute sincerity and our disinterested love of the pure idea, we have created (all of us who have devoted our lives to science) a new ideal of morality. But the judgments of history, taken broadly, ought not to be confined to considerations of personal merit. Marcus Aurelius and his noble masters left no lasting impress on the world. Marcus Aurelius left behind him delightful books, an execrable son, and a perishing empire. Jesus remains for humanity an exhaustless source of moral new birth. Philosophy does not suffice for the multitude: they must have sanctity. An Apollonius of Tyana, with his miraculous legend, is therefore more successful than a Socrates with his cool reason. "Socrates," it was said, "leaves men on the earth; Apollonius transports them to heaven. Socrates is but a sage; Apollonius is a god."[1] Religion, down to our day, has never existed without an element of asceticism, of piety, and of the marvellous. When it

[1] Philostratus, "Life of Apollonius," iv. 2; vii. 11; viii. 7. Ennapius, "Lives of the Sophists," pp. 454, 500 (ed. Didot).

was wished, after the Antonines, to make a religion of philosophy, it was necessary to transform the philosophers into saints; to write the "Edifying Life" of Pythagoras and of Plotinus, ascribing to them a legend, virtues of abstinence and contemplation, with supernatural powers, without which neither credence nor authority could be had in the world at large.

Let us beware, then, of mutilating history to satisfy our petty scruples! Which of us, pygmies as we are, could do what was done by the extravagant Francis of Assisi, or the hysterical Saint Theresa? Let medical science give its names to these grand estrays of human nature; let it maintain that genius is a disease of the brain; let it see in a peculiarly sensitive morality the first symptom of physical decline; let it class enthusiasm and love among nervous accidents, — it matters little. The terms health and disease are entirely relative. Who would not rather be diseased like Pascal than healthy like the common herd? The narrow notions current in our time respecting insanity most gravely mislead our historical judgments in questions of this kind. A state in which a man says things he is not conscious of, in which thought is produced without the summons and control of the will, exposes him to being confined as a lunatic. In old time this was called prophecy and inspiration. The noblest things in the world are done in a state of fever; every great creation involves a loss of balance; child-birth is, by a law of Nature, a process of agonising struggle.

We acknowledge, indeed, that Christianity is too complex to have been the work of a single man. In a sense, all men have been co-workers in it. There is no realm so walled in as not to receive some breeze

from without. History is full of strange coincidences, by which, without any mutual understanding, populations most remote from one another arrive at the same time at almost identical ideas and fancies. In the thirteenth century, the Latins, Greeks, Syrians, Jews, and Mussulmans are busied with scholasticism, and very nearly the same scholasticism, from York to Samarcand; in the fourteenth century, every one gives himself up to a passion for mystical allegory in Italy, Persia, and India; in the sixteenth, art is developed in a very similar manner in Italy and at the court of the Great Moguls, — though Thomas Aquinas, Abulfaragius, the Rabbis of Narbonne, and the *Motécallemin* of Bagdad had never known one another; though Dante and Petrarch had never seen a Sufi; though no pupil of the schools of Perusia or Florence had been at Delhi. We might say there are great moral influences running through the world like epidemics, without distinction of frontier or of race. The interchange of ideas among men is not brought about exclusively by books or by direct instruction. Jesus was ignorant of the very name of Buddha, Zoroaster, or Plato; he had read no Greek book, no Buddhist Sutra, — and yet there was in him more than one element which, without his suspecting it, came from Buddhism, Parseeism, or the Greek wisdom. All this was done through secret channels and by that kind of sympathy which exists among the various portions of humanity. The great man, on the one hand, receives everything from his age; on the other, he dominates his age. To show that the religion founded by Jesus was the natural growth of what had gone before does not diminish its excellence, but only proves that it had a reason for its existence; that it

was legitimate,—that is to say, in conformity with the instinct and wants of the heart in a given age.

Is it any more just to say that Jesus owed all to Judaism, and that his greatness is nothing else than the greatness of the Jewish people? No one is more disposed than myself to give high rank to this "peculiar people," which seems to have received the special gift of holding in its heart the extremes of good and evil. Jesus doubtless came forth from Judaism; but he came from it as Socrates came from the schools of the Sophists, as Luther from the Middle Age, as Lamennais from Catholicism, as Rousseau from the eighteenth century. A man belongs to his age and race even when he reacts against his age and race. Far from continuing Judaism, the special task of Jesus was to break with the Jewish spirit. The supposition that his thought as to this can admit of any doubt, is forbidden by the general direction of Christianity after him. Christianity has gone on, separating itself more and more from Judaism. Its completion will consist in returning to Jesus, — certainly not in returning to Judaism. The great originality of the founder will then remain undiminished; his glory admits no rival to share it with him.

Doubtless, circumstances count for much in the success of this marvellous revolution; but circumstances favour only such attempts as are in themselves right and true. Each branch of the development of humanity — art, poetry, religion — meets in the ages of its unfolding a privileged epoch, when it attains perfection without effort, by virtue of a certain innate quality of its own. No labour of reflection ever succeeds in producing afterwards the masterpieces which Nature

creates at those moments through inspired genius. What the golden age of Greece was for art and profane literature, the age of Jesus was for religion. Jewish society exhibited the most extraordinary moral and intellectual condition which the human species has ever passed through. It was one of those divine hours in which great things seem to grow of themselves, by the co-working of a thousand hidden forces; in which great souls find a flood of admiration and sympathy to bear them on. The world, delivered from that narrowest tyranny of petty municipal republics, enjoyed great liberty. Roman despotism did not make itself ruinously felt till long after; and it was, besides, always less oppressive in distant provinces than at the heart of the Empire. Our petty preventive interferences, far more murderous than torture to things of the spirit, did not exist. Jesus, during three years, could lead a life which in our societies would have brought him twenty times before the magistrates. Our laws upon the illegal practice of medicine would alone have sufficed to cut short his career. The dynasty of the Herods, on the other hand, sceptical from the beginning, occupied itself little with religious movements: under the Asmoneans, Jesus would probably have been arrested at his first step. An innovator in such a state of society risked only death; and death is a gain to those who labour for the future. Imagine Jesus reduced to bear the burden of his divinity until his sixtieth or seventieth year, losing his celestial fire, wearing out little by little under the burden of an unparalleled mission! Everything favours those who have a special destiny: they attain glory by a sort of invincible compulsion and command of fate.

This sublime Person, who day by day still presides over the destiny of the world, may well be called divine, — not in the sense that Jesus has absorbed all that is divine, or was one with it; but in the sense that he is the one who has impelled his fellow-men to take the longest step towards the divine. Mankind, taken as a whole, shows us a multitude of degraded beings, selfish, superior to the animal only in the one point that their selfishness is more reflective. Still, from the midst of this dead level of commonplace, columns rise towards the sky, and testify to a nobler destiny. Jesus is the loftiest of these columns, which show to man whence he comes and whither he should tend. In him was gathered whatever is good and elevated in our nature. He was not without sin; he overcame the same passions that we struggle against; no angel of God comforted him, except it was his good conscience; no Satan tempted him, other than each one bears in his heart. In the same way that many of his great qualities are lost to us through the lack of intelligence in his disciples, it is also probable that many of his faults have been concealed. But, more than any other, he made the interests of humanity predominate in his life over earthly vanities. Unreservedly devoted to his idea, he subordinated everything to it to such a degree that the universe existed no longer for him. It was by this transport of heroic will that he conquered heaven. There never was a man — Sakya-Muni alone perhaps excepted — who so completely trampled under foot family, worldly pleasure, and all temporal care. He lived only by his Father, and by the divine mission with which he believed himself charged.

As to us, evermore children, doomed to impotence, who labour without reaping, and who will never witness the fruit of that which we have sown, let us bow before these divine men. They could do that which we cannot do, — create, affirm, act. Will great originality be born again, or will the world henceforth be content to follow the paths opened by the bold originators of ancient time? We do not know. But, whatever unlooked-for events the future may have in store, Jesus will never be surpassed. His worship will unceasingly renew its youth; his story will call forth endless tears; his sufferings will subdue the noblest hearts; all ages will proclaim that among the sons of men no one has been born who is greater than he.

APPENDIX.

VALUE OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL AS AN HISTORICAL DOCUMENT.

The chief difficulty that meets the historian of the life of Jesus is to estimate rightly the authenticity of the sources on which he must rely. On the one hand, what is the value of the Gospels called "Synoptics;" on the other hand, what use is to be made of the Fourth Gospel? As to the former, all those who follow the critical method in dealing with these topics are substantially agreed. The Synoptics represent the tradition (often legendary) of the first two or three Christian generations regarding the person of Jesus. This leaves much uncertainty in the detail of the narrative, and compels the constant use of such phrases as, "It was said," "Some have related that," etc. Still, it is enough to inform us of the general character of the Founder, the method and main features of his teaching, and the most essential incidents of his life. Those writers of his biography who do not go outside the circle of the Synoptics differ from one another no more than the narrators of Mahomet's life, who make use of the *hadith*. The biographers of the Arabian prophet may have various opinions as to the authenticity of this or that anecdote; but in the main everybody is agreed as to the value of the *hadith:* everybody classes them as legendary or traditional material, true in their way, but not as accurate documents of history properly so called.

But there is no such agreement among scholars as to the use we are justified in making of the Fourth Gospel. I have

made use of this document with no end of reserves and precautions. In the opinion of excellent judges, I ought not to have made any use of it at all, with the possible exception of the eighteenth and nineteenth chapters, which contain the story of the Crucifixion. Almost all the intelligent criticisms I have received upon my work agree on that point. I am not surprised at this; for I could not be ignorant of the unfavourable opinion as to the historic value of the Fourth Gospel which prevails in the liberal schools of theology.[1] Objections coming from men so competent made it my duty to submit my opinion to a new examination. Disregarding for the present the question of authorship, I will now follow that Gospel through, paragraph by paragraph, as if it had but just appeared, without any author's name, as a manuscript newly discovered. Let us put aside every preconceived idea, and endeavour to make clear to ourselves the impressions produced on us by this unique composition.

1. *The Proem.* — The opening verses (i. 1–14) at first glance force upon us the gravest suspicions. They carry us into the very heart of Apostolic theology, show no likeness to the Synoptics, and put forth ideas assuredly very different from those of Jesus and of his true disciples. At the outset, this prologue warns us that the work in hand cannot be a simple history, transparent and impersonal, like the narrative of Mark, for example; that the author has a theology; that he wishes to prove a thesis, — namely, that Jesus is the Divine Word (*Logos*). Hence extreme caution is enjoined upon us. Must we, however, on the strength of this first page, reject the book throughout, and find an imposture in the fourteenth verse,[2] where the author declares that he has been a witness of the events which make up the life of Jesus?

This would be, I think, a very hasty conclusion. A work

[1] The arguments urged by the masters of these schools against [the authenticity of] the Fourth Gospel are ably set forth in Scholten's work, translated by Albert Réville (*Revue de Théologie*, 3d ser. vols. 2, 3, 4).

[2] Compare the first verse of the first Epistle of John.

full of theological motive may yet embrace valuable historical information. Do not the Synoptics write with the constant aim to demonstrate that Jesus realised all the messianic prophecies? Because of this, are we to give up searching for some kernel of history in their accounts? The theory of the *Logos*, so fully developed in the document before us, is not a reason for throwing it forward to the middle or close of the second century. The belief that Jesus was the *Logos* of the Alexandrian theology would no doubt suggest itself very early, and that in a strictly logical way. Happily, the founder of Christianity had no idea of that kind. But in the year 68 he is already called "the Word of God."[1] Apollos, who was from Alexandria, and who appears to have resembled Philo, passes already (about the year 57) for a new preacher, holding peculiar doctrines. These ideas are in perfect accord with the state of mind in which the Christian community found itself when it lost the hope of seeing Jesus appear soon in the clouds as the Son of Man. A change of the same kind seems to have been wrought in the opinions of Saint Paul. We know the difference there is between his earlier epistles and the last. The hope, for example, of the near coming of Christ, which pervades the two epistles to the Thessalonians, disappears toward the end of his life, and he then turns to another order of imagination. The doctrine of the Epistle to the Colossians is much like that of the Fourth Gospel: Jesus is represented in that epistle as the "image of the invisible God," the "first-born of every creature," through whom "everything has been created," who was "before all things," by whom "all things consist," in whom "dwells the fulness of the godhead bodily."[2] Is not this the very "Word" of Philo? I know there are those who reject the genuineness of "Colossians," but for reasons, in my opinion, altogether insufficient. These changes of theory, or rather of style, among the men of those times — times full of ardent passion — may well, within certain limits, be admitted.

[1] Rev. xix. 13. See, however, *post*, footnote, p. 426.

[2] Col. i. 15–20; ii. 9.

Why should not the crisis which came to pass in the soul of Paul have befallen other apostolic men in the last years of the first century? When the "kingdom of God," as it is described in the Synoptics and the Apocalypse, had become a chimera, they took refuge in metaphysics. The theory of the *Logos* naturally resulted from the disappointments of the first Christian generation. What men had hoped to see realised in the actual order of events was transferred to the ideal. Every delay in the coming of Jesus was one step more towards his deification; and this is so true that, at the very hour when the last Adventist dream vanished, the absolute divinity of Jesus was proclaimed.[1]

2. *John the Baptist.* — Let us come back to our text. Following established usage, the evangelist begins his narrative with the mission of John the Baptist. What he says of the relations of John with Jesus runs in many points parallel with the tradition of the Synoptics; in other points they diverge considerably. Here, again, the advantage is not with the text now in hand. The theory (soon so dear to all Christians) according to which John proclaimed the divine rank of Jesus, is carried quite too far by the fourth evangelist. We find a soberer view in the Synoptics, where John retains to the end some doubts as to the character of Jesus, and sends messengers to question him.[2] The narrative of the Fourth Gospel implies a perfectly pre-arranged plan, and confirms us in the idea already suggested in the prologue, that the author aims rather to prove than to record. We shall discover presently, however, that the author, though differing much from the Synoptics, yet holds many traditions in com-

[1] [Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho* (about A. D. 138) appears, however, to show that the disappointment of messianic expectations was first distinctly realised, and the Logos-doctrine was first accepted as a substitute for the defeated hope, after the destruction of the Jewish nation under Hadrian in A. D. 135. The Apostolic Fathers, and other Christian literature (such as the Gospel of Peter and the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles) prior to this date, are wholly silent as to the doctrine generally ascribed to the Apostle John.]

[2] Matt. xi. 2–6; Luke vii. 19–23.

mon with them. He cites the same prophecies; like them, he believes in a dove descending upon the head of Jesus as he goes up from baptism. But his narrative is less ingenuous, more advanced, more ripe, if I may so speak. One single detail arrests me; it is that (verse 28) which fixes the localities with precision. Granting, however, that the designation "Bethany" is inaccurate (as we know nothing of any Bethany in these parts, and the Greek interpreters have arbitrarily substituted *Bethabara*), what matter? A theologian having nothing of the Jew about him and no recollections direct or indirect of Palestine, — a mere theorist, like him who composed the prologue, — would not have put in that detail. What did this topographical nicety matter to a sectary of Asia Minor or of Alexandria? If the author inserted it, it was because he had a substantial reason for doing so, either in the documents he had in hand, or else in some traditions. Already, then, we are led to think that our theologian is indeed able to inform us of things in regard to the life of Jesus, of which the Synoptics have no knowledge. Nothing, it is true, indicates an eye-witness; but it must at least be supposed that the author had other sources than those which we have, and that to us he may well have the weight of an original authority.

3. *Calling of the Apostles.* — Beginning with verse 35, we read about a series of conversions of Apostles, connected in a way not very natural, and not corresponding with the accounts of the Synoptics. But can we say that these latter accounts have a superior historical value? No. The conversions of the Apostles told by the Synoptics are all cast in the same mould: we are sensible of a legendary and idyllic type, applied indiscriminately to all narratives of this class. The little incidents of the Fourth Gospel have more character and outlines less blurred. They are quite like ill-edited recollections of one of the Apostles. I know that stories told by simple-minded people and children always go much into detail. I do not insist upon the minutiæ of verses 39, 40.[1] But wherefore

[1] ["Rabbi, where dwellest thou?" etc.]

that idea of connecting the first conversion of disciples with the sojourn of Jesus near John the Baptist?[1] Whence come these so precise particulars about Philip, about the father of Andrew and Peter, and, above all, about Nathanael? The last named belongs exclusively to this Gospel. I cannot regard points so very precise, referring to him, as inventions concocted a hundred years later and far away from Palestine. If he is a symbolical person, why take pains to inform us that he was "of Cana in Galilee,"[2] a city that this evangelist appears to be particularly well acquainted with? Why should any one have invented all this? No dogmatic motive betrays itself if it be not in verse 51,[3] which is put in the mouth of Jesus. Above all, there is no symbolic motive. I believe in motives of this kind when they are indicated and (if I might say so) emphasised by the author. I do not believe in them when the mystic allusion does not appear plainly. The allegorising interpreter does not speak in half-sentences; he displays his argument and insists upon it with complacency. I say the same of sacramental numbers. The adverse critics of the Fourth Gospel have remarked that the miracles it records are seven in number. If the author himself should so sum them up, it would be a weighty point, and would prove his motive. Since the author does not so reckon them, what we find here is pure accident.

The discussion on this point, then, is fairly favourable to our text. Verses 35 to 51 have a more historic turn than the corresponding passages in the Synoptics. It seems that the fourth evangelist was better acquainted than the other narrators of the life of Jesus with what concerns the calling of the Apostles. I admit that in the school of John the Baptist Jesus attached to himself the first disciples whose names remain celebrated. I hold that the principal Apostles had

[1] I note (without attaching any importance to it) that the first three Apostles named by Papias (in Eusebius, *Hist.* iii. 39) are set in the same order as they first appear in the Gospel under review.

[2] John xxi. 2.

[3] ["I saw thee under the fig-tree," etc.]

followed John the Baptist before they became disciples of Jesus; and by this I explain the importance which the whole of the first Christian generation accorded to John the Baptist. If this importance, as is argued by the learned Dutch school, was in part factitious, and was devised almost wholly to support by an incontestable authority the part assigned to Jesus, why was John the Baptist chosen, a man who had no great repute except in the Christian family? The truth, as I think, is, that John the Baptist was for the disciples of Jesus not only a simple guaranty, but was also for them a former master, whose memory they indissolubly connected with the very beginning of the mission of Jesus.[1] A fact of greater importance — the rite of baptism, retained by Christianity as the necessary introduction to a new life — is a birth-mark which still visibly attests that Christianity was at first an offshoot from the school of John the Baptist.

Even if the Fourth Gospel, then, should be limited to the first chapter, still it must be defined as "a fragment made up of traditions or recollections, late written, and bound up with a theology far removed from the primitive gospel spirit; a chapter of legendary biography, in which the author accepts the traditional facts, often transforming them, but inventing none." If the question is one of *à priori* biography, it is far rather in the Synoptics that I find a biography of that sort. It is they who make Jesus to be born at Bethlehem, who make him go into Egypt, who bring the Magi to him, and so on, just as the case requires. It is Luke who invents or introduces persons that perhaps never existed.[2] The messianic prophecies, in particular, occupy our author less than the Synoptics, and occasion in him fewer fabulous tales. In other terms, we have already reached, so far as concerns the Fourth Gospel, the distinction between the substance of narrative and the substance of doctrine. The narrative we here

[1] See Acts i. 21, 22; x. 37; xiii. 24; xix. 4.

[2] The names of John the Baptist's parents, in Luke, have a fictitious air. The prophetess Anna (daughter of Phanuel), the aged Simeon, and Zacchæus are also doubtful persons.

find superior in certain points to that of the Synoptics; but the doctrine is far away from the actual discourses of Jesus, such as the Synoptics, particularly Matthew, have preserved to us.

A further circumstance strikes us just here. According to the author, the first two disciples of Jesus were Andrew and another. Andrew very soon gains over Peter, his brother, who is thus found to be cast a little into the shade. The second disciple is not named. But, in comparing this passage with others we meet later on, we are led to think that this unnamed disciple is no other than the author of the Gospel, or at least one who wishes to pass for the author. In the last chapters of the book, as we shall duly find, the narrator speaks with a certain mystery of himself; and, what is most remarkable, he still aims to rank himself before Peter, even when recognising his hierarchical superiority. We observe also that in the Synoptics the calling of John is closely connected with that of Peter; and that in the Acts John is continually represented as a companion of Peter. Thus a double difficulty confronts us; for, if the unnamed disciple is really John the son of Zebedee, one is led to think that John the son of Zebedee is the author of this Gospel. To suppose that a fabricator, wishing to make us believe that the author is John, has taken care not to name John and then to designate him in an enigmatical fashion, would be to impute to him a very strange artifice. On the other hand, are we to understand that if the real author of this Gospel began as a disciple of John the Baptist, he speaks of him in terms so little historical that the Synoptic narratives on this point are superior to his?

4. *The Miracle at Cana.*— Paragraph ii. 1–12 is a miraculous recital, like so many others to be found in the Synoptics. The structure of the narrative has an air slightly more theatrical, something less of simplicity; still, there is nothing in the groundwork that departs from the general colour of the tradition. The Synoptics do not speak of this miracle; but it is quite natural that in the rich legend of marvels then current some knew one detail, some another. The allegorical explan-

ation, based chiefly upon verse 10, according to which water and wine represent the old and the new covenant, imputes to the author, in my opinion, a thought which was not in his mind. Verse 11 proves that in his eyes the whole narrative has but one aim, — to manifest the power of Jesus. The mention of the little town of Cana, and of the sojourn the mother of Jesus made there, is not to be overlooked. If the miracle of water changed into wine had been invented by the author of the Fourth Gospel (as is supposed by those who deny the historic value of this Gospel), why this detail? Verses 11 and 12 make a clear sequence of facts. What interest would such local details have to Greek Christians of the second century? The apocryphal Gospels do not proceed like this. They are vague, without local detail, constructed by and for people who care nothing about Palestine. Let us add, further, that this evangelist speaks more than once of Cana in Galilee,[1] a very obscure small town. Why should he please himself in creating by an after-stroke a celebrity for that petty place, of which assuredly the semi-gnostic Christians of Asia Minor had but the faintest recollection?

5. *Visits to Jerusalem.* — That which follows verse 13 is of high interest, and shows this Gospel to great advantage. According to the Synoptics, Jesus, from the outset of his public career, makes only one visit to Jerusalem, where he remains but a few days, at the end of which he is put to death. This involves enormous difficulties which I do not repeat here, having already dealt with them.[2] A few weeks (even supposing it the intention of the Synoptics to give this length of stay to the interval between his triumphal entry and his death) are not enough for all that Jesus had to do at Jerusalem.[3] Many circumstances located by the Synoptics in Galilee — above all, the wranglings with the Pharisees — have but little meaning outside Jerusalem. All the events which fol-

[1] Chaps. iv. 46 and xxi. 2.

[2] See chap. xiii. of this volume, especially the note on page 228.

[3] Observe, for example, how ill put together are the incidents of Matthew (chaps. xxi. to xxv. inclusive), without date of time or place.

low the death of Jesus go to prove that his sect had taken deep root at Jerusalem. If the things had happened as Matthew and Mark relate, Christianity would have developed chiefly in Galilee. Those who had left their home but a few days back would surely not have chosen Jerusalem for their headquarters.[1] Saint Paul has no recollection whatever of Galilee: for him the new religion was born at Jerusalem. The Fourth Gospel, which recounts many journeys of Jesus to the capital and long sojourns there, appears then much nearer the truth. Luke, in this instance, seems to be in secret harmony with this view, or rather to alternate between two opposite opinions.[2] This is very important, for we shall presently bring forward other circumstances, in which Luke keeps close to the author of the Fourth Gospel, and seems to have had knowledge of the same traditions.

But here is a very striking point. The first circumstance of the stay of Jesus at Jerusalem reported by this evangelist is also reported by the Synoptics, and is placed by them almost at the eve of his death: this shows him driving the traders out from the Temple. Can we, with any show of likelihood, attribute such an act to a Galilean the very day after his arrival at Jerusalem? It must, however, have some reality, since it is reported by each of the four evangelists. In chronological arrangement, the advantage belongs entirely to the fourth. It is evident that the Synoptics have heaped upon the last days circumstances furnished to them by tradition, which they did not know where to place.

We come now to a question which it is time to clear up. We have already found that this evangelist held many traditions in common with the Synoptics, — the part played by John the Baptist, the dove at the baptism, the etymology of the name Cephas, the names of at least three of the Apostles, the traders driven from the Temple. Does the fourth evangelist derive all these from the Synoptics? No; for he shows

[1] Luke seems to feel this difficulty, and anticipates it by a revelation (chap. xxiv. 49; Acts i. 4).

[2] Chap. ix. 51–56; x. 25–28, 38–42; xvii. 11.

marked differences from them in these very incidents. Whence, then, came these narratives common to them all? Evidently from tradition, or else from his own memory. But what does this mean, except that the author has left to us an original version of the life of Jesus; that this Life ought to be put at the outset upon the same footing with the other biographies of Jesus, leaving us to decide afterwards as to details on such grounds as we may prefer? An inventor outright would have nothing in common with the Synoptics, or else would paraphrase them as the apocryphal Gospels do. His symbolic and dogmatic motive would in that case be much clearer. Everything in the story would then have a meaning and a motive. There would be none of these indifferent and (as it were) disinterested circumstances which abound in the present narrative. Nothing can less resemble the biography of an *Æon*. Not thus does the Hindoo write his Lives of Krishna, or relate the incarnations of Vishnu. An example of this sort of composition, in the first centuries of our era, is the *Pistis Sophia* attributed to Valentinus.[1] Here, there is nothing real; all is truly symbolic and ideal. I may say the same of "The Gospel of Nicodemus," an artificial composition founded entirely on metaphors. Between the Fourth Gospel and such extravagances as these there is a deep gulf; and, if we must at all costs find a parallel to them in the canonical evangelists, it would be in the Synoptics far rather than in the Gospel before us that we should have to seek for them.

6. *Destroy this Temple.* — Another incident follows (chap. ii. 18–22), related to the account given by the Synoptics in a way no less remarkable. These — at least Matthew and Mark — repeat, in connection with the trial of Jesus and his suffering on Calvary, words alleged to have been spoken by him, and to have made one of the chief grounds of his condemnation: "Destroy this temple, and I will build it up again in three days." The Synoptics do not say that Jesus had uttered these words; on the contrary, they treat that as false testimony.

[1] Discovered in a Coptic version and translated by Schwarze (Berlin, 1851).

This evangelist records that Jesus did in fact speak these incriminating words. Did he then borrow them from the Synoptics? It is hardly probable; for he gives a different version, and even an allegorical explanation (ii. 21, 22) which the Synoptics know nothing of. It seems, then, that here he adhered to an original tradition, — one more original even than that of the Synoptics, since they do not cite directly the expression of Jesus, and only report an echo of it. True, in putting this sentence two years before the death of Jesus, the compiler of the Fourth Gospel follows an idea which does not seem to be a very happy one. Observe the reference to Jewish history in verse 20[1]: it is aptly introduced, and sufficiently in keeping with Josephus.[2]

7. *In Jerusalem.* — The verses in chap. ii. 23–25[3] are rather unfavourable to the document in hand: they are sluggish, cold, and tiresome; they betray the apologist and the polemic. They prove a conscious compilation, much later than that of the Synoptics.

8. *Nicodemus.* — Let us look now at the episode of Nicodemus (chap. iii. 1–21). I give up, of course, the whole of the conversation of Jesus with that Pharisee, which is a fragment of apostolic, not evangelic, theology. Such a conversation could only have been reported by Jesus or Nicodemus, and both hypotheses are equally improbable. Moreover, beginning with verse 12, the author forgets the person he has put on the stage, and launches into a general elucidation which is addressed to all Jews. Here we have a glimpse of a marked characteristic in the author, — his liking for theological dialogues, and his tendency to connect them with incidents more or less historic. Fragments of this sort teach us nothing more about the doctrine of Jesus than the Dialogues of Plato do regarding the thoughts of Socrates. They are artificial compositions, not traditional. We can only compare them with the harangues which the ancient historians make no

[1] ["Forty-six years was this temple in building."]

[2] *Antiquities*, XX. ix. 7.

[3] [Relating miracles, etc., "at the Passover."]

scruple of imputing to their heroes. These discourses are far removed both from the style and the ideas of Jesus; on the contrary, they have a perfect family likeness to the theology of the prologue (chap. i. 1–14), where the author speaks in his own name. Is the circumstance to which the author appends this conversation historical, or is it his own invention? It is difficult to say. I incline, however, to the former view; for the fact is referred to farther on (xix. 39), and Nicodemus is mentioned elsewhere (vii. 50–52). I am led to believe that Jesus in reality had relations with a prominent person of that name, and that the author of this Gospel, who knew that circumstance, has chosen Nicodemus, just as Plato has taken Phædo or Alcibiades, as a character in one of his great speculative Dialogues.

9. *The Baptist at Ænon.* — The passage from verse 22 to chap. iv. 2, carries us, in my opinion, into real history. It shows us Jesus again with John the Baptist, but this time surrounded by a group of disciples. Jesus, like John, baptises; but he attracts the multitude more, and has greater success, than John. The disciples, like their master, baptise; and a jealousy, which the chiefs of the sect keep aloof from, arises between the two schools. This is quite remarkable, for the Synoptics contain nothing of the kind. As for me, I regard this episode as exceedingly probable. Certain unexplained details in it are far from invalidating its historical value as a whole. These were things then understood at the slightest allusion, perfectly in keeping with the character of personal memoirs intended for a limited circle. Such obscurities, on the contrary, are not to be accounted for in a work composed with the single aim of making certain ideas prevail. Those ideas would enter everywhere; there would not be so many singular incidents without apparent meaning. The topography, moreover, is here most precise (verses 22, 23). We do not know, it is true, where Salim was; but Ænon (Αἰνών) is a ray of light. It is the word *Ænawan*, the Chaldean plural of *Aïn* or *Æn*, "fountain." How can we suppose that Grecian sectaries from Ephesus would guess

at that? They would either have named no locality at all, or they would have given a name perfectly well known, or they would have coined one impossible as a bit of Semitic etymology.

The circumstance, again, that John was not yet cast into prison (v. 24) is also accurate and precise. Verse 25, whose connection with what precedes and follows is not very apparent, refutes the idea of a fictitious composition. We should say that here we have notes ill put together, old recollections, disconnected yet at times transparently clear. What could be more artless than the thought at verse 26, and repeated in the first verse of the fourth chapter? Verses 27–36 are of quite another character. The author falls back on his argument, to which it is impossible to grant any claim of authenticity. But verse 1 of chapter iv. is, again, quite clear; while verse 2 is essential. The author, repenting (as it were) of what he has written, and fearing lest evil consequences may be inferred from his narrative, instead of erasing it, inserts a parenthesis which flatly contradicts what has just gone before. He will no longer have it that Jesus has baptised; he asserts that only his disciples performed that rite. Granting that verse 2 was added later, still the fact remains that the passage (iii. 22–26) is by no means a fragment of *à priori* theology; since, on the contrary, the *à priori* theologian takes up the pen at verse 2 to contradict this passage, and to remove from it all that might prove embarrassing.

10. *The Woman of Samaria.* — We now come to the interview of Jesus with the Samaritan woman and the mission to the Samaritans (iv. 1–42). Luke knows of this mission,[1] which probably was real. Here, however, the theory of those who see in this Gospel only a series of fictions, designed to illustrate abstract truths, might apply. The details of the dialogue are evidently fictitious. On the other hand, the topography of verses 3–6 is satisfactory. Only a Palestinian Jew, who had often passed the entrance to the valley of Sichem, could have written that. Verses 5 and 6 are not

[1] Chap. ix. 51–56; xvii. 11.

exact; but the tradition here mentioned may have come from Gen. xxxiii. 19, xlviii. 22, and Josh. xxiv. 32. The author seems to make a play on words (*Sychar* for *Sichem*),[1] by which the Jews believed they cast bitter reproach upon the Samaritans.[2] I do not think that people at Ephesus were so very solicitous about the hatred which divided the Jews from the Samaritans, and the mutual interdict which existed between them (verse 9). The allusions which have been surmised in verses 16–18 to the religious history of Samaria [the woman's "five husbands"] seem to me to be forced. Verse 22 ["ye worship ye know not what," etc.] is significant. It interrupts the admirable sentence, "Woman, believe me, the time is come," etc., and expresses a quite opposite thought. It would seem that this is a correction like that in verse 2 of the same chapter, where either the author or one of his disciples corrects an idea which he finds dangerous or too bold. In any case, this verse is profoundly stamped with Jewish prejudices. I no longer find a meaning in it if it was written about the year 130 or 150, in a community of Christians the farthest removed from Judaism. Verse 35 is exactly in the style of the Synoptics, and of the actual words of Jesus ["the fields are white to the harvest"].

There remains the splendid passage, — verses 21, 23, omitting verse 22. There is no rigorous authenticity in such sentences. Can we admit that Jesus or the Samaritan woman related the conversation they had had together? With Orientals the manner of narration is essentially anecdotic; everything with them resolves itself into precise and palpable facts. Our general phrases, expressing a tendency or a general situation, are to them unknown. Here, then, is an anecdote which we can no more accept literally than any other anecdote of history. But an anecdote often has its own truth. If Jesus never uttered that divine word, the word is none the less his; it never would have existed without him. I am

[1] The word *Sichar* means "a lie."

[2] Moslems are continually, to this day, making ill-natured puns like this, to cloak their stealthy hatred of Franks and Christians.

aware that in the Synoptics there are frequent expressions wholly opposed to this: there are times when Jesus speaks of those not Jews very harshly; but there are others, too, in which the broad spirit dominant in this chapter of John is to be found.[1] We must choose between the two. It is in these last passages that I see the true thought of Jesus. The others are, in my opinion, blemishes and lapses, proceeding from disciples only half able to understand their master, and untrue to his thought.

11. *In Galilee.* — Verses 43–45 of chapter iv. contain something that surprises us. The author's view is that Jesus made his great demonstrations at Jerusalem, at the time of the feasts. This seems to be systematic with him; but what proves that such a system, though erroneous, was connected with real memories is that it is supported (verse 44) by a saying of Jesus,[2] also reported in the Synoptics, which has a high character of authenticity.

12. *The Healing at Capernaum.* — In verse 46 is fresh mention of the small town of Cana, which is not to be explained in a composition fictitious and merely dogmatic. Then (verses 46–54) there is a miracle of healing, strongly resembling those the Synoptics are full of, which with some variations corresponds to the one recorded in Matt. viii. 5–13, and in Luke vii. 1–10. This is very noteworthy, for it proves that the author does not invent his miracles at will, and that in recounting them he follows a tradition. To sum up: of the seven miracles he mentions, only two (the marriage feast at Cana and the resurrection of Lazarus) are without trace in the Synoptics. The five others are to be found in them, with some differences of detail.

13. *Pool of Bethesda.* — Chapter v. constitutes a fragment apart. Here the method of the author plainly appears. He relates a miracle said to have taken place at Jerusalem, with some dramatic details calculated to make the prodigy more

[1] Matt. viii. 11–13; xxi. 43; xxii. 1–14; xxiv. 14; xxviii. 19. Mark xiii. 10; xvi. 15. Luke iv. 26; xxiv. 47.

[2] ["A prophet hath no honour," etc.]

striking; and he seizes this occasion to insert long, dogmatic, and polemic discourses against the Jews. Does the author invent the miracle, or take it from tradition? If he invents it, we must at any rate admit that he had lived at Jerusalem, for he knows the city well (verses 2–4). The name *Bethesda* occurs nowhere else; yet, to have invented this name and the circumstances relating to it, the author of the Fourth Gospel must have known Hebrew, which the hostile critics of this Gospel do not admit. It is more probable that he found in tradition the substance of his account. This account is in some points strikingly parallel with Mark.[1] A part of the Christian community, then, attributed to Jesus miracles attested to have taken place at Jerusalem. This is a very serious matter. That Jesus should have acquired great renown as a wonder-worker in a country simple, rustic, and favourably disposed like Galilee is quite natural. Even had he not in a single instance taken part in the performing of marvellous acts, these acts would have taken place in spite of him. His wonder-working reputation would have spread, apart from all co-operation on his part, and without his knowledge. Miracle explains itself when in presence of a public well-disposed: it is then really the public that creates it. But before an ill-disposed public the matter is wholly different, as was clearly seen in the epidemic of miracles that prevailed in Italy five or six years ago.[2] The wonders asserted to have been wrought in the Papal States succeeded; those, on the other hand, which ventured to make their appearance in the Italian provinces, when investigated on the spot, were quickly checked. The patients said to have been cured confessed that they had never been sick. The workers of miracles themselves, on being interrogated, declared that they understood nothing about it; but that, seeing the rumours of their miracles to be widespread, they supposed they had done them. In other words, for a miracle to succeed there is need of a little management. If the bystanders do not assist, the actors must

[1] Compare John v. 8, 9, 16, with Mark ii. 9, 12, 27.

[2] [About 1870.]

lend a hand. Thus, if Jesus performed miracles at Jerusalem, we arrive at suppositions which are to us very shocking. Let us reserve our judgment; for we shall soon have to deal with a miracle at Jerusalem far more important than the one now in question, and much more intimately connected with critical events in the life of Jesus.

14. *Miracle of the Loaves.* — In chapter vi. 1–14 we have a Galilean miracle, again identical with one of those reported by the Synoptics; namely, the multiplication of loaves. It is clear that this is one of those attributed to Jesus in his lifetime, and it was doubtless occasioned by a real circumstance. There is nothing easier than to conceive such an illusion in minds at once credulous, artless, and sympathetic. "While we were with him, we had neither hunger nor thirst," — this very simple phrase grew into a marvellous fact, told once and again with all sorts of expansions. The narrative here, as always, looks more to the effect than in the Synoptics; in this respect, it is inferior to them. But the part which the Apostle Philip plays in it is to be noted. Philip is particularly well known to the author of the Fourth Gospel (comp. i. 43–50; xii. 21, 22). Now Philip resided at Hierapolis, in Asia Minor, where Papias knew his daughters.[1] All this fits together readily enough. We may say that the author took this miracle from the Synoptics, or some like source, and appropriated it in his own way; but why should the detail which he adds to it harmonise so well with what we know from other sources, if this detail did not come from a direct tradition?

15. *Walking on the Sea.* — By means of connections evidently artificial, which prove clearly that all these memories (if memory there be) were written long afterwards, the author introduces a strange series of miracles and visions (vi. 16–21). During a tempest, Jesus appears on the waves, seeming to walk upon the sea; the boat itself is miraculously transported.

[1] Eusebius, *Hist.* iii. 39 [also 31]: comp. Polycrates in Euseb. *Hist.* v. 24. True, there is a singular confusion between Philip the Apostle and the deacon of that name.

This miracle is also found in the Synoptics.[1] Here, then, we are yet in the region of tradition, not of individual fancy. Verse 23 fixes the localities, establishes a connection between this miracle and that of the multiplication of loaves, and seems to prove that these miraculous accounts ought to be put in the class of wonders which have a foundation of fact. The prodigy we are now discussing probably corresponds with some hallucination undergone by the companions of Jesus while on the lake, in virtue of which they, in a moment of danger, believed they saw their master come to their rescue. The idea into which they easily drifted, that his body was impalpable like a spirit,[2] gave credence to this. We shall soon find (chap. xxi.) another tradition which is founded on similar fancies.

16. *Preaching in Capernaum.* — The two miracles just mentioned serve to lead up to a most important discourse which Jesus is said to have delivered in the synagogue at Capernaum. This discourse evidently refers to a collection of symbols very familiar to the oldest Christian community, — symbols in which the Christ is presented as the bread of the believer. I have already said that in this Gospel the discourses ascribed to him are almost all artificial compositions, and this may certainly be one of that class. I will grant, if it is insisted on, that this fragment is of more importance for the history of eucharistic ideas in the first century than as exhibiting the ideas of Jesus himself. Still, I believe that this Gospel gives us here again a gleam of light. According to the Synoptics, the institution of the Eucharist does not go back beyond the last evening of Jesus' life. It is clear that this opinion was very early held; this, too, was the doctrine of Saint Paul.[3] But if we admit it to be true, then we must suppose that Jesus knew absolutely the day when he would die, — a supposition which we cannot grant. The usages which gave rise to the Eucharist went back, then, beyond the

[1] Matt. xiv. 22–33; Mark vi. 45–52.

[2] This was the origin of *docetism*, a heresy of the time of the Apostles.

[3] 1 Cor. xi. 23–28.

last supper; and I believe that the Gospel before us is completely within the truth in omitting the sacramental account on the evening of Thursday, and in strewing eucharistic ideas in the very midway of the life of Jesus. The story of what is essential in the Eucharist is in substance only the repetition of what takes place at every Jewish repast.[1] Not once, but a hundred times, Jesus must have blessed the bread, broken and distributed it, and also blessed the cup. I by no means claim that the words attributed to Jesus by the fourth evangelist are literally authentic; but the precise details furnished by verses 60–62 and 68, 70, 71, of chapter vi. have a stamp of their own.

Later on, we will again take notice of the personal ill-will felt by this writer against Judas of Kerioth. The Synoptics, certainly, have no affection for him; but in the fourth narrator the hate is more self-conscious, more personal. It recurs in two or three places before the account of the betrayal; it seeks to heap upon the head of the guilty man wrongs of which the other evangelists make no mention.

17. *Feast of the Tabernacles.* — Verses 1–10 of chapter vii. are a little historical treasure. The sullen ill-will of the brothers of Jesus and the precautions he is obliged to take are here expressed with admirable simplicity. Here, explanation by way of symbol and dogma is completely at fault. What dogmatic or symbolic motive can we find in this short passage, which is suited rather to raise objection than to serve the needs of the Christian apologist? Why should an author whose sole motto had been "We write in order to prove" have imagined such a fantastic detail? No, no! here we can say boldly, "We write to tell the truth." This is an original memory, come whence it might, and whosever the pen that wrote it. How can we say, after this, that the persons of this Gospel are mere types, mere characters, and not historic beings of flesh and bone? In fact, it is truer to say that the Synoptics have an idyllic and legendary turn: compared with

[1] See chapter xviii. of the present volume, pages 301–305, and compare with the account of the Therapeutæ in *Hist. of Israel*, 318–321.

them, the Fourth Gospel has the air of history, and of being a narrative whose sole aim is to be precise.

18. *The Living Water.* — Now comes a dispute (vii. 11–53) between Jesus and the Jews, to which I attach little value. Scenes of this kind must have happened quite often. The writer's imagination puts a powerful stamp on all that he relates; with him, such pictures can hardly be very true in colour. The discourses he puts in the mouth of Jesus correspond with his ordinary style. The intervention of Nicodemus (verses 50–52) is all that here can have historic value. Verse 52, it may be urged, is open to the objection of containing an error which neither John nor even a Jew would have committed. Could the writer be ignorant that Jonah and Nahum were born in Galilee? Yes, certainly, he might not know it; or, at least, he might not think of it. The historical and exegetical knowledge of the evangelists, and of the New Testament writers in general (Saint Paul excepted), is very incomplete. In any case they wrote from memory, and were not careful to be scrupulously exact.

19. *The Adulterous Woman.* — The account of the woman taken in adultery (chap. viii. 3–11) gives room for grave critical doubts. This passage is wanting in the best manuscripts; I believe, however, that it constituted part of the primitive text. The topographical data of verses 1 and 2 are correct. There is nothing in the fragment inharmonious with the style of the Fourth Gospel. I think it is through a misplaced scruple, which occurred to some false rigorists as to the apparent moral laxity of the episode, that these lines were cut away, — which yet, in view of their beauty, were saved by attaching them to other parts of the Gospel texts. In any case, if the incident of the adulterous woman did not at first form a part of the Fourth Gospel, it is surely of evangelical tradition. Luke is acquainted with it, though in a different form.[1] Papias seems to have read a similar account in the Gospel according to the Hebrews.[2] The sentence "Let any

[1] Chap. vii. 37–50.

[2] In Eusebius (*Hist.* iii. 39). An Armenian scholar, M. Prudhomme

one among you who is without sin," etc., is so perfectly in accord with the spirit of Jesus, and corresponds so well with other passages of the Synoptics, that we are fully entitled to consider it as authentic, — quite as much as the Synoptic tradition itself. At all events, we can much more easily understand why such a passage may have been cut out than added.

20. *Light of the World.* — The theological disputes which fill up the remainder of chapter viii. are without any value in the life of Jesus, to whom the author evidently attributes his own ideas, without confirming them by any testimony, or from his own memory. How, it might be said, could an immediate disciple, or one who received the tradition directly from an Apostle, thus alter the words of the Master? But Plato was surely an immediate disciple of Socrates; and yet he makes no scruple of writing fictitious discourses in his master's name. The "Phædo" contains historical information of the strictest truth, along with discourses not in the least genuine. The tradition of facts is much better kept than that of discourses. An active Christian school, running rapidly through its circle of ideas, could not fail in fifty or sixty years to modify completely the image that had been conceived of Jesus; while it might recall, far better than all the others, certain peculiarities and the general structure of the biography of the reformer. On the other hand, the simple and gentle Christian families of Batanæa, among whom was formed the collection of the *Logia*, — small groups, very pure and very honest, of *ebionim* ("God's poor"), who remained most faithful to the teachings of Jesus, piously guarding

of whom I asked whether he had met any citations from Papias in Armenian authors, sends me a curious passage taken from "Expositions of sundry passages of Holy Scripture" by Vartan Vartabed (Armen. MSS. in the Imperial Library, old collection, no. 12, fol. 46 v.): "The passage on the adulterous woman, which other Christians have in their Gospel, is the work of a certain Papias, a disciple of John who wrote of heresies, and has been rejected. So Eusebius says. It was written later." The Armenians, in fact, either reject this passage, or put it at the close of the Fourth Gospel.

the treasury of his words, and thus making a little world in which there was hardly any movement of ideas, — may very well have preserved the actual tone of the Master's voice, and be at the same time quite ill-informed as to the biographical circumstances, of which they made little account. The distinction here indicated recurs, moreover, in our estimate of the first Gospel. This is surely the one which gives us the best rendering of the discourses of Jesus, and yet it is more inaccurate than the second as to facts. It is vain to urge unity of composition in the Fourth Gospel. This unity I indeed recognise; but a composition drawn up by a single hand may yet embrace data of very unequal value. The "Life of Mahomet" by Ibn-Hischam is strictly the work of a single hand; and yet it contains some things which we can admit, others which we cannot.

21. *The Man born Blind.* — The passage in the two chapters ix. 1–x. 21 forms an episode beginning with a new miracle in Jerusalem (that of the man born blind), where the motive of heightening the demonstrative force of the prodigy is felt more tiresomely than anywhere else. We discern, however, a fairly accurate knowledge of the topography of Jerusalem (verse 7); thus the explanation of "Siloam" is rather good. It is impossible to pretend that this miracle was evolved from the symbolic fancy of the writer; for it is also found in Mark (viii. 22–26), coinciding in a minute and curious circumstance (compare John ix. 6 with Mark viii. 23). In the discussions and discourses which follow, I acknowledge that it would be dangerous to seek an expression of the real thought of Jesus. A marked feature in the writer, which now becomes prominent, is his habit of taking a miracle as a point of departure for long argumentative discourses. The miracles he narrates are reasoned and commented on. This is not the case with the Synoptics. Their theurgy is perfectly artless: they never retrace their steps in order to make a point from the marvels which they have related. The theurgy of the Fourth Gospel, on the contrary, is reflective, set forth with artifices of exposition aiming to convince, and wrought up in favour of certain

preachments which the author makes follow the account of his prodigies. If this Gospel contained nothing else besides these fragments, the opinion which sees in it a mere treatise of theology would be fully justified.

22. *Historical Features.* — But it is far from being merely this. Beginning with verse 22 of chapter x., we enter into topographical details strictly accurate, which are hardly explicable if it is maintained that this Gospel contains no Palestinian tradition whatever. I give up the entire dispute contained in verses 24–39. The journey to Peræa, on the other hand, related in verse 40, appears to be historical. The Synoptics know of this journey, to which they attach the various incidents of Jericho.

23. *The Raising of Lazarus.* — We come now to a most important passage (xi. 1–45). It relates to a miracle, but a miracle which surpasses all others, and is produced under peculiar circumstances. All the other miracles of any notoriety are wrought upon obscure persons, who never again figure in the gospel history; but in this instance the miracle takes place in the heart of a well-known family,[1] and is one in which the writer in particular, if he is sincere, seems to have had a hand. The other miracles are simple episodes, aiming indeed to prove by their number the divine mission of the Master, but by themselves of no consequence, since not one of them is ever referred to afterwards, or forms an essential feature in the life of Jesus. They can be treated in the lump, as I have done in my work, without shaking the edifice or breaking the sequence of events. The miracle in this case, on the contrary, is deeply imbedded in the record of the last weeks of Jesus, as given in this Gospel. Now, we shall see that it is precisely on account of that record of these last weeks that the narrative in hand stands out incontestably superior to the others. This miracle thus makes by itself a class apart: at first glance it seems as if it ought to be reckoned among the events in the biography. The minute detail of the account is not what impresses me. The two other

[1] See Luke x. 38–42.

miracles at Jerusalem, of which the writer speaks, are told in similar detail. Granting that all the circumstances of the resurrection of Lazarus might be the product of the writer's imagination, and that all these circumstances were proved to have been combined with a view to their effect (a constant habit with this author, as we have noticed), still the main fact would none the less be exceptional in the gospel story. The miracle of Bethany is to the Galilean miracles what the *stigmata* of Saint Francis are to his other miracles. Karl Hase has composed an exquisite Life of the Umbrian Saint,[1] in which he does not insist particularly upon any of these miracles; but he saw clearly that it would not be an honest biography if he did not put weight upon the *stigmata:* he devotes a long chapter to them, leaving room for all sorts of conjectures and suppositions.

Among the miracles scattered over the four compilations of the life of Jesus, a distinction shows itself at once. Some are legendary creations pure and simple, occasioned by nothing whatever in the real life of Jesus, being simply the outgrowth of the active fancy that busies itself about all popular celebrities; while others rest on a foundation of veritable fact. Legend did not arbitrarily attribute to him the healing of those "possessed with devils;" more than once, doubtless, he fully believed that he had wrought such cures. The multiplication of loaves, many cures of sickness, perhaps certain apparitions, may be put in the same class. These are not miracles hatched out of pure imagination; they are miracles suggested by real incidents, exaggerated or else transfigured. Let us absolutely discard an idea which is very widespread, that no eye-witness reports miracles. The author of the last chapters of the Acts is surely an eye-witness of the life of Paul; and he, as we see, records miracles which must have taken place before his sight.[2] What do I say? Paul himself speaks to us of his own miracles, and founds upon them the

[1] In the original, *du Christ ombrien.*

[2] Acts xx. 7–12; xxvii. 11, 21–43; xxviii. 3–6, 8–10.

truth of his preaching.[1] Certain miracles were permanent in the Church, and were in some sort common property.[2] "Why," it is said, "claim to be an eye-witness, when you tell things that cannot have been heard or seen?" But then the "three companions" did not know Saint Francis of Assisi; for they record a multitude of things which could not have been seen or heard.

In what class must we place the miracle which we are now discussing? Did some actual fact, exaggerated and embellished, give rise to it? Or, again, has it no reality of any sort? Is it a pure legend, an invention of the narrator? What complicates the difficulty is that the third Gospel (that of Luke) offers us here most curious coincidences. Luke, in fact, knows Martha and Mary; he knows too that they did not belong to Galilee; in short, he knows them in a light very like that under which these two persons figure in the Fourth Gospel. Martha, in the latter text, plays the part of a servant (*διηκόνει*); Mary shows herself of an ardent, eager temper. We know the admirable little episode which Luke has built upon this.[3] But, if we compare the passages in Luke and in the Fourth Gospel, it is clearly this last which plays here the original part: not that Luke, or whoever the writer of the third Gospel may be, has read the fourth; but only that we find in this latter Gospel the data which explain the legendary anecdote of the third. Does the third evangelist also know Lazarus? After having long refused to admit this, I have come at length to regard it as very probable. Yes, I now think that the Lazarus in the parable of the rich man is but a transformation of him who is here raised from the dead.[4]

[1] 2 Cor. xii. 12; Rom. xv. 19. He calls the miracles "signs of an Apostle" (*σημεῖα τοῦ ἀποστόλου*): comp. Gal. iii. 5.

[2] 1 Cor. i. 22; xii. 9, 10, 28–30: comp. 2 Thess. ii. 9. The Jewish tradition represents Jesus and his disciples as wonder-workers and exorcists (Midrash, *Koheleth*, i. 8; vii. 26. Babylonian Talmud, *Aboda zara*, 27 *b*; *Schabbath*. 104 *b*. Jerusalem Talmud, *ibid*. xiv. 4).

[3] Luke x. 38–42.

[4] See pages 332, 345, 346 of the present volume.

Let it not be said that in thus being metamorphosed it has been much changed in the process. In a matter of this sort everything is possible: thus the repast of Martha, Mary, and Lazarus, which plays a great part in the Fourth Gospel, and is placed by the Synoptics in the house of Simon the Leper, becomes in the third a repast at the house of Simon the Pharisee, where there figures a "woman that is a sinner," who, like Mary in this Gospel, anoints the feet of Jesus and wipes them with her hair. What clew can we hold in this inextricable labyrinth of broken and patched-up legends? For my part, I admit the family of Bethany to have had a real existence, and to have given rise in certain branches of the Christian tradition to a cycle of legends. One of these legendary data was that Jesus had called back to life the head of the family himself. Certainly, such a report may have originated after the death of Jesus; I do not, however, think it impossible that a real fact in his life may have given it birth. The silence of the Synoptics in regard to the episode at Bethany does not impress me much. The Synoptics were very scantily informed as to all that immediately preceded the last week of Jesus' life. Not only the incident at Bethany is lacking in them, but also the whole period to which this incident relates. We come back once more to that fundamental point: the real question is, Which of the two accounts is the true one, — that which makes Galilee the theatre of all the activity of Jesus, or that which represents him as passing a part of his life at Jerusalem?

I know the efforts that have been made to explain this miracle as an allegory. According to the learned and profound defenders of this system, it signifies that Jesus is to believers in a spiritual sense "the resurrection and the life." Lazarus is the poor man (*ebion*), raised by the Christ from his state of spiritual death. It is on account of this, in view of a popular awakening which begins to disturb them, that the official classes decide on putting Jesus to death. This is the theory upon which the best theologians of our day repose. In my opinion it is an erroneous one. That the Fourth Gospel

is dogmatic, I see clearly; but it is by no means allegorical. The really allegorical writings of the early centuries — the Apocalypse, the "Shepherd" of Hermas, the *Pistis Sophia* — have quite a different air. At bottom, all this symbolism is an offshoot of the mythical theory of Strauss, — the expedient of theologians at their wit's end, seeking refuge in allegory, myth, and symbol. We, who seek only for pure historic truth without a shade of afterthought, either theological or political, must be more free. For us, all this is not mythical; it is not symbolic; it is the popular story of a religious crisis. We must feel our way in it distrustfully, but not make a deliberate policy of specious explanations.

Various examples are adduced. The Alexandrian school, such as we know it through the writings of Philo, had unquestionably a strong influence on the theology of the Apostolic century. Now, do we not see this school press its taste for symbolism to pure unreason? Did not the whole of the Old Testament become in its hands a mere pretext for subtile allegories? Are not the Talmud and the Midraschim full of pretended historical information destitute of all truth, which can be explained only by religious tenets or by the desire of inventing arguments in support of an assumption? But this is not the case with the Fourth Gospel. The principles of criticism which it is proper to apply to the Talmud and the Midraschim, cannot be applied to a composition quite remote from the taste of the Palestinian Jews. Philo sees allegories in the ancient texts; he does not invent allegorical texts. An old sacred book exists; the plain meaning of this text embarrasses or is insufficient; we seek in it some hidden and mysterious meaning: examples of this process abound. But that one should write an extended historical narrative with the deliberate intention of concealing in it symbolic riddles not to be discovered till seventeen hundred years later, — that is what we shall scarcely find. It is the partisans of the allegorical explanation who in this case represent the Alexandrians. It is they who, embarrassed by the Fourth Gospel, treat it just as Philo treated Genesis, just as the

Jewish and Christian tradition has treated the Song of Songs. For us simple historians, who admit at the outset, first, that the question here is only one of legends, in part true, in part false, like all legends ; secondly, that the reality which served as the ground-work of these legends was noble, splendid, touching, and delightful, but, like all things human, greatly marred by weaknesses which would repel us if we saw them, — for us, I say, there is no difficulty. There are texts from which it is our business to extract the largest amount of historic truth we can: that is all.

Another very delicate question here comes into view. Were not the miracles of the second class, which owe their origin to some real fact in the life of Jesus, sometimes a little manipulated ? I believe so ; or at least I declare that if it was not so, the birth of Christianity was an event absolutely without parallel. It was the greatest and the noblest of all events of its class ; but it did not escape the common laws which govern the facts of religious history. There is not a single great religious creation which has not involved something of what would now be called fraud. The ancient religions were full of it.[1] Few institutions in the past are better entitled to our gratitude than the Oracle of Delphi, seeing that that Oracle eminently contributed to save Greece, the mother of all science and all art. The enlightened patriotism of the Pythoness was not more than once or twice found at fault. She was ever the mouthpiece of sages endowed with the justest sentiment of Greek interests. These sages, who founded civilisation, made no scruple about consulting this virgin, who was reputed to be inspired by the gods. Moses, if the traditions we have regarding him contain anything historical, made use of natural events (such as tempests and fortuitous plagues) to further his designs and his policy.[2] All

[1] We have the tangible proof of this in the temple of Isis at Pompeii, the Erechtheum at Athens, and other cases.

[2] The revival and (so to speak) the second founding of Wahhabism in central Arabia was occasioned by the cholera of 1855, turned skilfully to account by the zealots. Palgrave's "Narrative," i. 407.

the ancient legislators gave their laws as by inspiration of a god. All the prophets, without any scruple, gave out their sublime invectives as the words of the Eternal. Buddhism, full of such high religious sentiment, lives on permanent miracles, which cannot be self-produced. The most artless country of Europe, the Tyrol, is the country of the stigmatics, a fashion which is possible only by means of a little complicity. The history of the Church, so admirable in its way, is full of false relics and false miracles. Was there ever a religious movement more ingenuous than that of Francis of Assisi? Yet the whole history of the *stigmata* is inexplicable without some connivance of his intimate companions.[1]

"People," I am told, "do not get up spurious miracles when they think they everywhere see true ones." This is an error. It is when people believe in miracles that they are led, without suspecting it, to increase their number. We can with difficulty, having our clear and precise convictions, figure to ourselves the strange illusions by which these obscure but powerful consciences, playing (so to speak) with the supernatural, would slide incessantly from credulity to connivance, and from connivance to credulity. What can be more striking than the mania, widespread at certain epochs, of attributing apocryphal books to the ancient sages? The apocryphas of the Old Testament, the writings of the Hermetic cycle,[2] the innumerable falsely-inscribed productions of India, respond to a great elevation of religious sentiments. It was thought to do honour to ancient sages by attributing to them these productions; one would work at the task without ever thinking that a day would come when it would be called a fraud. The authors of the mediæval legends, magnifying in cold blood upon their desks the miracles of their saints, would also be much surprised to hear themselves called impostors.

The eighteenth century explained all religious history as imposture. The critic of our times has totally discarded that

[1] See Karl Hase, *Franz von Assisi*, chap. xiii. and appendix.

[2] [Certain theosophic writings pertaining to Hermes Trismegistus (a name of the Egyptian god *Thoth*).]

explanation. The term is certainly improper; but to what extent the most beautiful souls of the past have aided their own illusions, or those of which they were the object, is what our reflective age can no longer comprehend. To see this clearly, one must have been in the East. In the East, passion is the soul of everything, and credulity has no limits. We never get at the bottom of an Oriental's thought, because this bottom often does not exist for himself. Passion on one side, credulity on the other, make imposture. Thus no great movement is produced in that country without some fraud. We no longer know how to desire or to hate; cunning finds no longer a place in our society, for it no longer has an object: but exaltation and passion do not come to terms with the coldness and the indifference to results which make the ground of our sincerity. When absolute natures of the Oriental type adopt an opinion, they do not retract; and when illusion becomes necessary, they stick at nothing. Is that for lack of sincerity? Not at all; it is because conviction is very intense in such minds, because they are incapable of turning back upon themselves, that they have less scruple. To call this "trickery" is incorrect: the very ardour with which they embrace their idea extinguishes in them every other thought; for the end appears to them so absolutely good, that whatever can serve it seems in their view legitimate. Fanaticism is always sincere in its belief, but unscrupulous in respect of its choice of methods of demonstration. If the public do not at once accept the reasons it believes to be good, — that is to say, its affirmations, — it has recourse to reasons which it knows to be bad. With it, to believe is everything: the motives which induce belief are of little account. Would we accept the responsibility of all the arguments through which the conversion of the barbarians was wrought? In our days people employ fraudulent devices only when they know the falsity of what they maintain. Formerly, the employment of these means implied a profound conviction, and was allied to the highest moral elevation. We critics, who profess to unravel falsehood and to discover the truth through the network of deceptions

and illusions of every sort which envelop history, feel a sentiment of repugnance in the presence of such facts. But let us not impose our scruples upon those whose duty it has been to guide poor human nature. Between the general truth of a principle and the truth of a petty fact the man of faith never hesitates. We had at the time of the coronation of Charles the Tenth the most authentic proofs of the destruction of the sacred flask [of Rheims]. The sacred flask was found again because it was needed. On the one side, there was the salvation of royalty, — so at least it was believed; on the other, the question of the genuineness of some few drops of oil: no good royalist hesitated.

In fine, among the miracles which the Gospels attribute to Jesus there are some purely legendary. But there were quite probably others in which he consented to play a part. Let us put aside the Fourth Gospel. The Gospel of Mark, the most original of the Synoptics, is the biography of an exorcist and wonder-worker. Some details (as in Luke viii. 45, 46)[1] are no less painful than those which in the episode of Lazarus lead the theologians to cry aloud for the interpretation by myth and symbol. I do not hold to the historic reality of the miracle in question. The supposition proposed in the present edition reduces everything to a misapprehension. I have sought only to show that this strange episode of the Fourth Gospel is not a decisive objection to its historic value. Throughout that portion of the life of Jesus on which we are now about to enter, this Gospel contains many special points of information far superior to any in the Synoptics. Now, singularly enough, the story of the resurrection of Lazarus is joined to these last pages by a bond so close, that, if we reject it as imaginary, the whole edifice of the last weeks of the life of Jesus, so solid in this Gospel, would crumble at the blow.

24. *Council of Caiaphas.* — Verses 46–54 of chapter xi. exhibit to us a first secret council held by the Jews, with a

[1] [That of the "woman having an issue of blood" (comp. Matt. ix. 20–22; Mark v. 25–34).]

view to destroy Jesus, as a direct consequence of the miracle at Bethany. It may be said that this connection is forced and artificial. How much more probable is the narration here than in the Synoptics, which make the conspiracy against Jesus begin only two or three days before his death! The whole account we are now looking at is, besides, very natural; it ends with a circumstance which was surely not invented, — the flight of Jesus to Ephraim, or Ephron. What allegorical meaning is to be found in that? Is it not evident that the author has data totally unknown to the Synoptics, who, with little care to compose a regular biography, compress into a few days the last six months of the life of Jesus? Verses 55, 56 show a chronological arrangement which is very satisfactory.

25. *The Supper at Bethany.* — An episode follows (xii. 1–11) common to all the narrators excepting Luke, who has in this instance cut his material in another shape: I mean the supper at Bethany. We have seen in the "six days" of verse xii. 1 a symbolical reason, — namely, the intention of making the day of the anointing coincide with the tenth of Nisan, the day on which the paschal lambs were selected (Exodus xii. 3, 6). The analogy, however, is not very clear. At chapter xix. 36, where the design appears of likening Jesus to the paschal lamb, the author is much more explicit.[1] As to the incidents of the feast, is it from a mere fancy that he here enters into details unknown to Matthew and to Mark? I do not think so. It is that he knows more about them. The woman unnamed in the Synoptics is Mary of Bethany. The disciple who makes the observation is Judas; and his name immediately leads the narrator into lively personal attack (v. 6),[2] breathing strongly the animosity of fellow-disciples who have lived long together, who have chafed sharply against each other, and whose paths have led them wide apart. Then the phrase "Martha served" explains so fully an entire episode of Luke;[3] and the hair that wiped the feet of Jesus is also found in

[1] ["A bone of him shall not be broken."]

[2] ["Because he was a thief," etc.]

[3] [Chap. x. 40–42: "Thou art careful and troubled about many things."]

Luke.[1] All leads to the belief that we have here an original source, which serves as a key to other more distorted narratives. I do not deny the strangeness of verses 1, 2, 9–11, 17, 18, which recur three times to the resurrection of Lazarus, reinforcing xi. 45, 46. On the contrary, I see nothing at all unlikely in the design imputed to the family of Bethany, of rousing the indifference of the city-dwellers by outward signs such as simple Galilee knew nothing of. It must not be said that such suppositions are false because they are shocking or pitiful. If we should see the reverse of the greatest things that have ever happened in the world, those which enchant us, those we live by, nothing would abide. Note also that the actors here are women who have imbibed that unequalled love which Jesus had the power to inspire in those around him,—women, believing that they lived at the very heart of marvels, who were convinced that Jesus had done innumerable prodigies, and placed face to face with sceptics who jested at him they loved. If a scruple could have arisen in their soul, the recollection of other miracles of Jesus would have silenced it. Suppose a legitimist lady forced to the extremity of assisting Heaven to save the infant prince.[2] Would she hesitate? Passion always lends to God its own angers and personal desires; it enters into the councils of God, makes him speak, makes him act. One is sure he is right; he serves God by maintaining his cause, making good the zeal which deity does not show.

26. *Entry to Jerusalem.* — The account of the triumphal entry of Jesus into Jerusalem (xii. 12–19) is in harmony with the Synoptics. What astonishes us here, again, is the reiterated appeal to the miracle of Bethany (verses 17, 18). This is the miracle that compels the Pharisees to decide on the death of Jesus; this is the miracle that makes the people of the city believe; this is the miracle that brings about the triumph of Bethphage. I should like to put the whole of this to the ac-

[1] Chap. vii. 38.

[2] [The allusion is to the hiding of the infant Joash (4 Kings xi. 23), as in Racine's *Athalie*, especially to the passionate appeal in Act i. sc. 2, verses 235–264.]

count of an author of the second century, ignorant of the real character and the artless innocence of the Galilean movement. But first let us not suppose that innocence and self-conscious illusion cannot exist together. We must here seek for parallels in the fugitive sensations of the soul of an Oriental woman. Passion, simplicity, unrestraint, tenderness, perfidy, poetry and crime, frivolity and depth, sincerity and deceit, alternate in such natures, and baffle any absolute estimate. Criticism in such cases must guard against any rigid rule. The mythical explanation may be often true; yet the historical explanation ought not to be excluded. Now look at verses xii. 20–26, which contain the unmistakable stamp of history. First is the obscure and isolated episode of "certain Greeks," who address themselves to Philip. Remark the part played by this Apostle; the Fourth Gospel is the only one that knows anything of it. Remark, especially, how free the entire passage is from any dogmatic or symbolic motive. To say that these Greeks are reasonable beings, like Nicodemus and the Samaritan woman, is quite beside the purpose. The discourse which they invite (verses 23–26) has nothing to do with them.

The aphorism in verse 25[1] is found again in the Synoptics, and is evidently authentic: the writer does not copy it from the Synoptics. And so, even when he makes Jesus speak, the author of the Fourth Gospel will now and then follow a tradition.

27. *Prayer of Jesus.* — Verses 27–36 are very significant: Jesus is troubled; he prays his Father "to deliver him from this hour;" then he resigns himself. A voice is heard from heaven; or better, according to other accounts, an angel speaks to Jesus. What is this episode? Without doubt it is the parallel of the agony of Gethsemane, which indeed is omitted by the writer where it should have been found, — after the last supper. Remark the incident of the apparition of an angel, known to Luke alone, — one more to add to the series of those agreements between the third Gospel and the fourth, — a circumstance so very significant in gospel criticism. But

[1] ["He that loveth his life shall lose it," etc.]

the existence of two versions so different, given to an incident of the last days of Jesus which is certainly historic, constitutes a fact much more decisive still. Which is here to be preferred? The Fourth Gospel, in my opinion. First, the narrative of this Gospel is less dramatic, less skilfully adjusted and constructed, — less beautiful, I admit. In the second place, the situation where the Fourth Gospel introduces this episode is much more suitable. The Synoptics carry forward the scene of Gethsemane, like other solemn circumstances, to the last evening of Jesus' life, through the tendency that leads us to gather up our recollections upon the last hours of a beloved person. Besides, these circumstances placed thus have more effect. But to admit the order of the Synoptics we must suppose that Jesus knew with certainty the day on which he should die. In general, we find the Synoptics often yielding to a desire for effective arrangement, and proceeding with a certain art. Art divine, whence has emerged the most beautiful popular poem that was ever written, — the Passion! But undeniably, in such a case, the historical critic will always prefer the version which is least dramatic. It is this principle which makes us place Matthew lower than Mark, and Luke lower than Matthew, when the task is to determine the historical value of a story in the Synoptics.

28. *The Last Interview.* — We have now reached the last evening (chapter xiii.). The farewell repast is described, as in the Synoptics, at great length; but we are surprised to find no account of the main circumstance of this repast, as reported in the Synoptics. There is not a word about the establishment of the Eucharist, which is of so pre-eminent importance in the writer's view (see chap. vi.); and yet, how reflective a turn (verse 1) is given to the story! how the writer insists upon the tender and mystic significance of the last feast! What does this silence mean? Here, as in the episode of Gethsemane, I see in such an omission a mark of superiority in the Fourth Gospel. To assert that Jesus reserved for the Thursday evening so important a ritual institution is to believe in a sort of miracle; it supposes that he was certain of dying the

next day. Although Jesus (as we may believe) had presentiments, we cannot, apart from the supernatural, admit such precision in his foresight. The disciples grouped all their eucharistic remembrances upon the last supper. This displacement of the events, as I consider, is not difficult to explain. Jesus here, as he had done many times before, practised the habitual custom of the Jewish table, attaching to it the mystical sense he delighted in; and, as the last supper was much better recalled to mind than any other, there was general agreement in referring to it this fundamental rite. The authority of Saint Paul, which is here in accord with the Synoptics, is not decisive, as he was not himself present at the repast; it proves only (what no one can doubt) that a great part of the tradition fixed the establishment of the sacred memorial on the eve of Jesus' death. This tradition answered to the generally accepted opinion that on that evening he substituted a new Passover for the Jewish; it also held to another opinion of the Synoptics, contradicted by the Fourth Gospel, — namely, that Jesus partook with his disciples of the paschal feast, and died, consequently, on the morrow of the day when the paschal lamb was eaten.

It is very noticeable that the Fourth Gospel, in place of the Eucharist, gives another rite — the washing of feet — as having been the proper institution of the last supper. Doubtless, the evangelist has for once yielded to the natural tendency of referring to the last evening the solemn acts in the life of Jesus. His hatred of Judas is displayed more and more, through a strong pre-disposition which makes him speak of this wretch even when he is not directly concerned (see verses 2, 10, 11, 18). In the story of the announcement made by Jesus of his treachery, the great superiority of this account is again apparent. The same anecdote is found in the Synoptics, but is presented in an improbable and contradictory way. In the Synoptics Jesus is represented as designating the traitor in indirect language, and yet the expressions he makes use of must have made him known to all. The fourth evangelist explains clearly this little misapprehension. According to

him, Jesus privately confides his presentiment to a disciple leaning upon his bosom, who in turn communicates to Peter what Jesus has said to him. In regard to the others present, Jesus remains in mystery, and no one has any suspicion of what has passed between him and Judas. The little details of the account, the broken bread, the glimpse which verse 29 gives us of the inner life of the sect, are very clear and precise; and when we hear the writer saying quite plainly, "I was there," one is inclined to think that he speaks the truth. Allegory is essentially cold and stiff; the persons in it are brazen figures, and move all of a piece. It is not so here. What strikes us in his narrative is life, reality. We perceive a passionate man, jealous because he loves much, and susceptible; a man much like the Orientals of our day. Artificial compositions never have this personal air; something vague and awkward always betrays their origin.

29. *The Discourses.* — Now follow long discourses of a certain beauty, but doubtless having in them nothing traditional. They are fragments of theology and rhetoric, in no way resembling the discourses of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels, and without any more historical reality than the discourses which Plato puts into the mouth of Socrates just before his death. This view of them decides nothing as to the value of the context. The discourses inserted by Sallust and Livy in their histories are assuredly fictions; but are we to conclude from this that the groundwork of these histories is fictitious? It is probable, moreover, that in these long homilies attributed to Jesus there is more than one feature of historic value. Thus, the promise of the Holy Spirit (xiv. 16–18, 26; xv. 26; xvi. 7, 13), which Mark and Matthew do not give in a direct form, is found in Luke (xxiv. 49), and corresponds with a statement in Acts (ii.)[1] which must have had some reality. In any case, this idea of a spirit which Jesus will send from the bosom of his Father, when he shall have quitted the earth, is another instance of agreement with Luke (Acts i. and ii.). The idea of the Holy Spirit conceived as Advo-

[1] Compare John vii. 20 with Acts ii. 7–13.

cate (*Paraclete*) is also found, especially in Luke (xii. 11, 12: compare Matthew x. 20; Mark xiii. 11). The scheme of the ascension, expanded by Luke, has its obscure germ in the fourth evangelist (xvi. 7).

30. *The Betrayal.* — After the supper the fourth evangelist, like the Synoptics, conducts Jesus to the Garden of Gethsemane (chap. xviii.). The topography of verse 1 is exact.[1] I have commented elsewhere upon the omission of the agony at this particular moment, an omission in which I see an argument in favour of the account in the Fourth Gospel. The arrest of Jesus is also much better told. The incident of the kiss of Judas — so touching, so beautiful, but having a legendary air — is passed over in silence. Jesus answers to his name, and gives himself up. There is, indeed, a very useless miracle (verse 6);[2] but the incident of Jesus requesting that the disciples with him may be allowed to go away (verse 8) is plausible. It is quite possible that they may have been at first arrested with their master. Faithful to his habits of precision — whether real or apparent — the writer knows the names of the two persons who were for the moment engaged in a struggle resulting in a little bloodshed.

31. *Annas the High Priest.* — But here comes the plainest proof that the author has evidence on these events distinctly more original than that of the other evangelists. He alone states that Jesus was conducted to Annas (or Hanan) the father-in-law of Caiaphas. Josephus confirms the truth of this account, and Luke seems here again to catch (as it were) an echo of the Fourth Gospel.[3] Hanan had for a long time been deposed from the high-priesthood; but during the remainder of his long life he in reality retained the power,

[1] τῶν κέδρων may be an inadvertence of the copyist, — or, if we might say so, of the editor, the one who prepared the narrative for the public. The same error is to be found in the Septuagint (2 Sam. xv. 23). The *Codex Sinaïticus* reads τοῦ κέδρου. The true reading τοῦ κεδρών would appear strange to people who knew only Greek.

[2] ["They went backward and fell to the ground."]

[3] Luke iii. 2 ["Annas and Caiaphas being the high-priests"]: comp Acts iv. 6.

which he exercised in the name of his sons and sons-in-law, who were successively raised to the sacerdotal sovereignty.[1] This circumstance (unsuspected by the first two Synoptics, who were very ill-informed as to matters at Jerusalem) is a gleam of light. How could a sectary of the second century, writing in Egypt or Asia Minor, have known it? The too-often repeated opinion that the author knows nothing of Jerusalem or of Jewish matters appears to me utterly without foundation.

32. *Peter's Denial.* — A better account is also given here of Peter's denial: this whole episode is much more circumstantial and better explained. The details of verses 16–18 [the incident of the maid-servant] are surprisingly lifelike. Far from finding them improbable, I seem to see in them a mark of simplicity, — as of a provincial, who boasts a footing among officials because he is acquainted with a doorkeeper or a domestic. Will it be maintained that here, too, there is some mystic allegory? A rhetorician coming long after the events, and composing his work from accepted texts, would not have written like that. Look at the Synoptics: everything is in simple good faith combined for the best effect. Certainly, many a detail of the Fourth Gospel hints also at artificial arrangement; but others seem to be there simply because they are true, so haphazard are they, and so keenly pointed.

33. *Eve of the Passover.* — We come now to the house of Pilate. The incident of verse 28 has all the appearance of truth.[2] The writer is at variance with the Synoptics as to the day on which Jesus died. According to him, it was on the day on which the paschal lamb was eaten, the 14th of Nisan; according to them, it was the day following. Here he may well be in the right. Their error would be easily explained by their desire to make of the last supper the paschal feast, so as to give it more solemnity and to keep a motive for the celebration of the Jewish Passover. True, it may also be said

[1] Josephus, *Antiq.* XV. iii. 1; XX. ix. 1, 3. *Wars* IV. v. 6, 7.

[2] [The refusal of the Jews to enter "lest they should be defiled."]

that the Fourth Gospel has put the death of Jesus on the day when the paschal lamb was eaten, so as to inculcate the idea that Jesus himself was the true paschal lamb, — an idea which he once expresses (xix. 36), and which is possibly hinted in other passages (xii. 1; xix. 29). What, however, clearly proves that the Synoptics here do violence to historical reality is that they add a circumstance taken from the ordinary ceremony of the Passover, and not certainly from a positive tradition, — the singing of a psalm.[1] Certain incidents reported by them — for example, the circumstance that Simon of Cyrene was returning from his labours in the fields — assume that the crucifixion took place before the sacred season began. Finally, we cannot suppose that the Jews would have insisted on an execution, or even that the Romans would have carried one out, on a day so solemn.[2]

34. *At Pilate's Judgment Seat.* — I say nothing of the conversations of Pilate and Jesus,[3] composed evidently from mere conjecture, yet with a correct enough feeling as regards the situation of the two. The question in verse 9 ["Whence art thou?"] has again its echo in Luke; and, as usual, that insignificant detail becomes in the third Gospel a complete legend.[4] The topography and the Hebrew [*Gabbatha*] of verse 13 are sound. The whole scene is quite historical in tone, even though the language imputed to the speakers is in the narrator's style. What concerns Barabbas, however, is more satisfactory in the Synoptics. The writer is doubtless mistaken in calling this man "a robber" (xviii. 40). The Synoptics are much nearer probability in representing him as a man dear to the people and arrested in consequence of a riot. As regards the scourging, too, Mark and Matthew add a slight hint: in their account we see better that this was simply the usual preliminary of crucifixion. The author of the Fourth Gospel does not seem to suspect

[1] Matt. xxvi. 30; Mark xiv. 26.

[2] Mishna, *Sanhedrin*, iv. 1: comp. Philo, *In Flaccum*, 10.

[3] Luke xxiii. 6–9.

[4] [Namely, that, finding Jesus to be of "Herod's jurisdiction, he sent him to Herod." Luke xxiii. 6–12.]

that it implied a sentence already fixed and irrevocable. Here, again, he proceeds in perfect accord with Luke (xxiii. 16); and, like him, he seeks in everything which concerns Pilate to exculpate the Roman authority and throw the burden on the Jews.

35. *The Coat without Seam.* — The petty detail of the seamless coat (verse 23) furnishes also an argument against this writer. It might be said that the notion of it arose from his not having rightly caught the parallelism of the passage in Psalm xxii., which he cites. We have a similar error in Matt. xxi. 2–5, — the ass and her colt. Perhaps also the seamless vestment of the high-priest [1] has something to do with all this.

36. *Women at the Cross.* — We touch now upon the most serious objection to the writer's veracity. Matthew and Mark represent the Galilean women, the inseparable companions of Jesus, as alone present at the crucifixion. Luke adds to them "all his acquaintance," [2] — an addition completely at variance with the first two Gospels, which relate that "all forsook him and fled," [3] and with what Justin tells us of the defection among the disciples after the crucifixion.[4] At all events, in the first three Gospels this group of the faithful keep "afar off" from the cross, and hold no converse with Jesus. The Fourth Gospel adds three essential details: 1. Mary, the mother of Jesus, is present at the crucifixion; 2. John is also present; 3. They both stand at the foot of the cross, — Jesus converses with them, and confides the care of his mother to his favourite disciple. This is most singular. "The mother of the sons of Zebedee," or Salome, whom Matthew and Mark place among the faithful women, is deprived of these honours in the recital which is assumed

[1] Josephus, *Antiq.* III. vii. 4.

[2] [Luke xxiii. 49, *πάντες οἱ γνωστοὶ αὐτοῦ.*]

[3] Matt. xxvi. 56; Mark xiv. 50. The parallel passage in Luke (xxii. 54) is altered to agree with xxiii. 49: compare the statements in chap. xxv. of this volume.

[4] *Apol.* i. 50; *οἱ γνώριμοι αὐτοῦ πάντες.*

to have been written by her own son. The name "Mary" given to the sister of Mary, the mother of Jesus, is also a most singular thing. Here I am wholly with the Synoptics. "That the knowledge of the affecting presence of Mary near the cross, and the filial duties which Jesus commits to John," says Strauss, "should be forgotten, is far less easy to understand than why all this should have grown up in the circle where the Fourth Gospel took shape. Supposing it to be a circle in which the Apostle John enjoyed especial veneration, — the proof of which we see in the care taken by this Gospel to select him from among the three closest confidants of Jesus, to make of him the one Apostle well-beloved, — could anything be found which would sanction this preference in a more striking manner than a solemn declaration of Jesus, who, by a last act of his will, bequeaths to John his mother as the most precious legacy, substitutes him in his own place, and makes him 'Vicar of Christ?' — not to say, how natural it was to ask, as to both Mary and the beloved disciple, whether it was possible for them to be afar off from Jesus at the moment of his death."

This is very happily put. It completely proves that the compiler had more reasons of his own than one; that he has not the entire sincerity and simplicity of Matthew and Mark. But it is just here that we find the plainest evidence of the origin of the work under review. In comparing this passage with others where the privileges of "the disciple whom Jesus loved" are set forth, there can be no doubt as to the Christian group whence this book proceeded. It does not prove that an immediate disciple of Jesus wrote it; but it proves that he who holds the pen believes, or wishes it to be believed, that he records the recollections of an immediate disciple of Jesus, and that his intention is to exalt the prerogative of that disciple; to show that he was what neither James nor Peter had been, — a true brother, a spiritual brother, of Jesus.

In either case, the new accord which we have found between his text and the Gospel of Luke is very remarkable. The words of Luke, in fact (xxiii. 49), do not exactly exclude

Mary from the foot of the cross; and the author of the Acts — who is certainly the same as that of the third Gospel — places Mary among the disciples at Jerusalem a few days after the death of Jesus. This is of small historical value; for the author of the third Gospel and of the Acts (at least of the first chapters of the latter work) is the traditionist of least authority in all the New Testament. Still, it establishes more and more this fact (in my view a very weighty one), — that the Johannine tradition was not an isolated accident in the primitive Church; that many traditions belonging to the school of John had become known or were common to other Christian churches, even before the compilation of the Fourth Gospel, or at least independently of it. For to suppose that the author of the Fourth Gospel had the Gospel of Luke before his eyes when composing his work appears to me most improbable.

37. *Vinegar and Gall.* — Our text is again superior in what concerns the potion offered on the cross. This circumstance — with respect to which Matthew and Mark express themselves obscurely, which in Luke is entirely transformed (xxiii. 36) — finds here its true explanation. It is Jesus himself who, burning with thirst, asks for drink. A soldier offers him, on a sponge, a little acidulated water (xix. 28–30). This is very natural, and most consistent with ancient usage. It is done neither in derision nor to aggravate his torment, as the Synoptics suppose. It is a humane action on the part of the soldier.[1]

38. *The Earthquake.* — The Fourth Gospel omits the earthquake and other phenomena which, according to the most widely circulated legend, accompanied the last breath of Jesus.

39. *Prophecies.* — The episode of the breaking of legs and the lance-thrust, peculiar to this Gospel, is certainly possible. The ancient Jewish and Roman customs mentioned in verse 31 are exact. The *crurifragium* was indeed a Roman mode of execution. As to the symptom [of blood and water] spoken of in verse 34, much may be said. But even though the writer

[1] [See *post*, p. 467.]

should give proof here of an imperfect physiology, no inference can be drawn from this. I am aware that the lance-thrust may have been invented to accord with Zechariah xii. 10 (compare Rev. i. 7). I recognise that the *à priori* symbolic explanation is well adapted to the circumstance that Jesus was not subjected to the breaking of legs. The author wishes to liken Jesus to the paschal lamb (compare chap. i. 29); and it suits this view very well indeed that the bones of Jesus were not broken.[1] Nor was he perhaps displeased that a little hyssop should be introduced.[2] As for the water and the blood which flowed from his side, it is equally easy to discover their dogmatic value.[3] Is it to be said that the author of the Fourth Gospel invented these details? I know very well that some may reason thus: Jesus, as Messiah, was to be born at Bethlehem; hence the accounts, most improbable on other grounds, which make his parents go to Bethlehem on the eve of his birth, belong to fiction. But can it also be said that it was written beforehand that not a bone of Jesus was to be broken, and that water and blood should flow from his side? Is it not admissible that these things really happened, things which the afterthought of the disciples would remark in later time, finding in them profound providential combinations? I know nothing more instructive in this respect than to compare what is said of the potion offered to Jesus before the crucifixion in Mark (xv. 23) and in Matthew (xxvii. 34). Mark here, as almost always, is the more original. According to his account, Jesus is offered, as was customary, an aromatic wine,[4] to dull the sense of pain. There is nothing messianic in this. According to Matthew, the aromatic wine becomes a compound of gall and vinegar, and thus is brought about an asserted fulfilment of Psalm lxix. 22. Here, then, is one instance where the process of transformation is caught in the act. If we had only the narrative of Matthew, we

[1] Exod. xii. 46; Num. ix. 12.

[2] John xix. 29: comp. Ex. xii. 22; Levit. xiv. 4, 6, 49, 51, 52; Num. xix. 6; Heb. ix. 19.

[3] Comp. John iii. 5; 1 John v. 6.

[4] "Wine mingled with myrrh."

should be authorised to believe that that circumstance was of pure invention; that it was fabricated to show the fulfilment of a passage supposed to refer to the Messiah. But the account of Mark clearly proves that there was in this instance an actual fact, which was bent to fit the messianic interpretation.

40. *The Burial.* — At the interment, Nicodemus, a person known only to this Gospel, re-appears. It must be observed that he plays no part in the early apostolic history. Moreover, of the Twelve Apostles, seven or eight disappear completely after the death of Jesus. It seems that there were near Jesus groups which accepted him in very different degrees, and some of these do not figure in the history of the Church. The author of the teachings which form the basis of the Fourth Gospel may have known friends of Jesus who remained strangers to the Synoptics, living as these did in a narrower sphere. The gospel company was very different in the different Christian circles. James, the Lord's brother, a man in Saint Paul's view of the first importance, plays a quite secondary part in all the four Gospels. Mary of Magdala, who according to all the evangelists is the most conspicuous figure in the story of the resurrection, is not included by Saint Paul among those to whom Jesus showed himself; and after that solemn hour she is no more seen. It was the same in the case of Bâbism. In the accounts we possess of the origins of that religion, which substantially agree, the persons who appear differ quite sensibly. Each witness has seen the fact from his own point of view, and has attributed a special importance to such of the founders as were known to him.[1]

41. *John and Marcion.* — An important point results from the discussion which we have followed. The Fourth Gospel, disagreeing very considerably with the Synoptics until the last week, is throughout the whole account of the Passion in general accord with them. We cannot say, however, that it

[1] Observe here a new textual coincidence between Luke (xxiii. 53) and John (xix. 41), as to the "new sepulchre."

has borrowed from them ; for, on the contrary, it keeps quite apart from them, and copies none of their expressions. If the author of the Fourth Gospel had read some portion of the synoptic tradition, which is very possible, it must at least be said that it was not before his eyes when he wrote. What is to be concluded from this ? That he had a tradition of his own, — a tradition running side by side with that of the Synoptics, so that we can decide between the two only by intrinsic reasons. A narrative composed as a work of art, an *à priori* gospel, written in the second century, would not have been like that. Like the apocryphal writers, the author would have cast his material in the mould of the Synoptics, only amplifying them to suit his own purpose. The position of the Johannine writer is that of an author not ignorant of what has previously been written on the subject he is treating, who approves many things in what has been already said, but who thinks himself to be possessed of superior information, and gives it without disturbing himself about the others. This may be compared to what we know of the Gospel of Marcion. Marcion made himself a gospel from motives like those attributed to the author of the Fourth Gospel. But observe the difference: Marcion restricted himself to a sort of harmony, or extracts made on a precise plan. A composition of the sort imputed to the author of this Gospel, if that author lived in the second century and wrote with the motive imputed to him, is absolutely without precedent. That is neither the eclectic and conciliatory method of Tatian and of Marcion, nor the exaggerated copywork of the apocryphal Gospels, nor the wholly arbitrary and non-historic reverie of the *Pistis Sophia*. To get rid of certain dogmatic difficulties, one falls into difficulties of literary history quite unsolvable.

42. *John and Peter.* — The agreement of the Fourth Gospel with the Synoptics, which strikes one in the narrative of the Passion, is hardly discernible (at least as regards Matthew) in that of the resurrection and what follows. But, here again, I think this writer much nearer the truth. According to him, Mary Magdalene alone goes first to the tomb; alone, she is the

first messenger of the resurrection, which accords with the close of the Gospel of Mark (xvi. 9–20). On the news brought by Mary Magdalene, Peter and John go to the tomb, — another most remarkable coincidence, even in the expression and the little details, with Luke (xxiv. 1, 2, 12, 24) and with the close of Mark as preserved in the Manuscript L and in the margin of the Philoxenian version.[1] The first two evangelists do not speak of a visit of the Apostles to the sepulchre. A decisive authority gives the advantage here to the tradition of Luke and of the Johannine writer: it is that of Saint Paul. According to the First Epistle to the Corinthians,[2] written about the year 57, — long, at any rate, before the Gospels of Luke and John, — the risen Jesus first appeared to Cephas. True, this assertion of Paul agrees better with the account of Luke, who mentions only Peter, than with the account in the Fourth Gospel, according to which the well-beloved Apostle accompanied Peter. But the first chapters of the Acts constantly show us Peter and John as inseparable companions. It is probable that at this decisive moment they were together; that together they were informed of the event, and that they ran together.[3]

The ingenuous personal characteristics here exhibited are almost signs manual: the uncompromising adversaries of the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel set themselves a hard task when they insist on seeing in them the artifices of a forger. The design of the author to place himself close beside or before Peter in important circumstances (i. 35–43; xiii.

[1] Ed. Griesbach-Schulz, i. 291. This conclusion, though not the earliest, is still of value as containing an ancient tradition. [The Philoxenian version is a Syriac translation of the New Testament made early in the sixth century, at the instigation of Philoxenus, the Monophysite bishop of Hierapolis.]

[2] 1 Cor. xv. 5–8.

[3] The close of Mark in the Manuscript L makes use of the vague formula: *οἱ περὶ τὸν Πέτρον*. This formula may, in strictness, indicate Peter alone: comp. John xi. 19, and the Greek lexicon on the phrase *οἱ περί*. [It is, however, a late use: *οἱ περί* (like *οἱ ἀμφί*) *τινα* signifies in classic Greek "a person with his companions."]

23–25; xviii. 15-18) is everywhere noticeable. Explain it how we will, these passages can hardly have been compiled much later than the death of John. The account of the first goings and comings on Sunday morning, which are somewhat confused in the Synoptics, is here perfectly distinct. Yes, here is the original tradition, the disjointed members of which have been arranged by the three Synoptics in three different ways, all of them inferior, in point of likelihood, to the scheme of the Fourth Gospel. Remark that at the decisive moment, on Sunday morning, the disciple assumed to be the author does not claim to have had any vision of his own. A forger, writing without regard to tradition for the purpose of exalting the chief of a school, would not have committed the blunder, in the midst of a rolling fire of apparitions reported in every tradition of these first days,[1] of attributing it to a favourite disciple, just as it was done for James.

Note again the coincidence [as to the "two angels in white"] between Luke xxiv. 4 and John xx. 12, 13. Matthew and Mark have only one angel at this point. Verse 9 is a flash of light ["For as yet they knew not the scripture, that he must rise again from the dead"]. The Synoptics are quite beyond belief when they assert that Jesus had predicted his own resurrection.

43. *The Risen Jesus.* — The apparition which follows — that which takes place before the Apostles assemble on the Sunday evening — coincides well with the account of Paul.[2] But it is with Luke that the agreements here become striking and decisive. Not only the apparition takes place on the same date, in the same presence, but the words pronounced by Jesus are the same; the circumstance of Jesus showing his feet and hands is slightly transposed, but it is found in both, while it is wanting in the first two Synoptics.[3] The Gospel of the Hebrews here keeps step with the third and

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 5–8.

[2] John xx. 19–21 (comp. with 1 Cor. xv. 1–7).

[3] Comp. Luke xxiv. 36–40 with John xx. 19–29.

fourth Gospels.[1] "But why," it might be said, "hold as the account of an eye-witness a tale which contains manifest impossibilities? Is not one who does not admit the miracle, and yet admits the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel, forced to regard as an imposture the formal assurance of verses 30, 31?"[2] Certainly not. Paul also affirms that he saw Jesus; and yet we do not reject either the genuineness of the first chapter to the Corinthians or the veracity of Paul.

44. *The Holy Spirit.* — A peculiarity of this Gospel is that the gift of the Holy Spirit occurs on the very evening of the resurrection (John xx. 22: comp. vii. 39). Luke (Acts ii. 3–5) places this event after the ascension; it is, however, noticeable that John xx. 22 has its parallel in Luke xxiv. 49. Only the turn of the expression in Luke is made indefinite, so as not to contradict the account of Acts (ii. 1–5). Here, again, the third and fourth Gospels communicate with each other through a kind of secret channel.

45. *The Sequel.* — Like all critics, I put the close of the Fourth Gospel at the end of chapter xx. Chapter xxi. is an addition, but an addition nearly contemporaneous, either by the author himself or by one of his disciples. It contains the account of a new apparition of the risen Jesus. Here again important coincidences with the third Gospel are to be remarked (compare John xxi. 12, 13, with Luke xxiv. 41–43), not to mention certain resemblances to the Gospel to the Hebrews.[3]

46. *Special Traits.* — Details somewhat obscure follow (verses 15–25), in which we have a livelier sense than anywhere else of the imprint of the Johannine school. Here again we are met by the constant recurrence of the relations between John and Peter. This entire sequel resembles a series of private notes which have no meaning except to him who has

[1] Fragment in Epist. of Ignatius to the Smyrnæans, verse 3, and in Jerome, *De viris illustribus*, 16.

[2] ["Many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples," etc.]

[3] See Jerome, *De viris illustribus*, 2.

written them, or to the initiated. The allusion to the death of Peter; the feeling of amicable and fraternal rivalry between the two Apostles; the belief, hinted with reserve, that John should not die before seeing the reappearance of Jesus, — all seems frank and simple. The exaggeration, in bad style, of verse 25 is not felt to be out of place in a composition so inferior, in the literary sense, to the Synoptics. This verse, besides, is lacking in the *Codex Sinaïticus;* and verse 24, finally, seems a formal ending, while the words, "And we know that his witness is true," are an addition of the writer's disciples, — or, rather, they induce the belief that the last editors utilised notes or recollections of the Apostle. These protestations of veracity are found in almost the same words in two writings which are [apparently] by the same hand as this Gospel.[1]

47. *Conclusion.* — Thus, in the account of the life of Jesus beyond the tomb, the Fourth Gospel retains its superiority. This superiority is seen especially in the general view of the situation. In the Gospel of Luke, and in Mark (xvi. 9–20), the life of the risen Jesus has the appearance of enduring only for a day. In Matthew it seems to have been short. In the Acts (chapter i.) it continues forty days. In the three Synoptics and in the Acts it terminates by an adieu, or by an ascension into heaven. Matters are arranged in the Fourth Gospel in a less conventional way. The life beyond the tomb has no fixed limits; it is prolonged somehow indefinitely. Elsewhere I have pointed out the superiority of this view.[2] It suffices for the present to recall that it responds much better to the important passage of Saint Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 5–8.

What is the result of this long analysis? (1) That, considered by itself, the narrative of the most essential incidents in the life of Jesus, as given in the Fourth Gospel, is superior in point of probability to that of the Synoptics; (2) That, on

[1] 1 John i. 1–4; 3 John, verse 12.

[2] In "The Apostles," chap. i.–iii.

the other hand, the discourses which the Fourth Gospel imputes to Jesus have in general no character of authenticity; (3) That the author has a tradition of his own of the life of Jesus, very different from that of the Synoptics, except as concerns the last days; (4) That this tradition, meanwhile, was pretty widely spread, — for Luke, who does not belong to the school whence this Gospel proceeded, has an idea more or less vague of many of the facts known to this writer, which Matthew and Mark knew nothing about; (5) That the work is less beautiful than the Synoptic Gospels, — Matthew and Mark being masterpieces of spontaneous skill, and Luke presenting an admirable combination of ingenuous art and of reflection, while the Fourth Gospel gives us only a series of notes, very badly arranged, in which legend and tradition, reflection and simple candour, run ill together; (6) That the author of the Fourth Gospel (whoever he may be) has written to exalt the authority of one of the Apostles, to show that this Apostle had played a part in circumstances where he is not mentioned in the other narratives, and to prove that he knew things which the other disciples knew not; (7) That the author of the Fourth Gospel wrote at a time when Christianity had advanced beyond the Synoptics, and with a more exalted idea of the divine office of Jesus, — the figure of Jesus being with him more rigid, more hieratic, like that of an Æon or a divine *hypostasis*, who operates through his own will; (8) That if his material information is more exact than that of the Synoptics, his historic colouring is much less so, — so that, in order to seize the general physiognomy of Jesus, the Synoptic Gospels, despite their omissions and their errors, are still the most trustworthy guides.

Naturally, these reasons in favour of the Fourth Gospel would be greatly strengthened if it could be established that the author of this Gospel is the Apostle John, son of Zebedee. But this is an inquiry of another sort. Our aim has been to examine the Fourth Gospel by itself, independently of its author. This question of authorship, assuredly, stands alone in literary history. I know of no question of criticism in

which contrary appearances are so evenly balanced, and the mind is held more completely in suspense.

It is clear, first of all, that the author wishes to pass as an eye-witness of the gospel facts (i. 14; xix. 35), and as the friend preferred by Jesus (xiii. 22–25; xix. 26, 27; compared with xxi. 24). It is to no purpose to say that chapter xxi. is an addition, since this addition is by the author himself or by his school. In two other places, moreover (i. 35–37; xviii. 15, 16), one sees clearly that the author loves to speak of himself in covert language. One of two things must be true: either the author of the Fourth Gospel is a disciple of Jesus, an intimate disciple, and belonging to the earliest period; or else the author, in order to give himself authority, has followed from first to last a systematic artifice, with the intention to persuade his readers that he was a witness as well situated as possible to render a true account of the facts.

Who is the disciple of whose authority the author thus seeks to avail himself? The title shows: it is "John." There is not the least reason for supposing this title to have been added against the wish of the real author. It was certainly written at the head of this Gospel at the end of the second century. On the other hand, the gospel history gives us, besides John the Baptist, only a single person of the name of John. We must, then, choose between two theories, — either acknowledge John, son of Zebedee, as the author of the Fourth Gospel; or regard that Gospel as an apocryphal writing composed by some one who wished to pass it off as a work of John, son of Zebedee. The question here is not, in fact, of legends, — the work of multitudes, for which no person is responsible. A man who in order to give credence to his declaration deceives the public not only as to his name, but also as to the value of his testimony, is not a writer of legends; he is an impostor. A biographer of Francis of Assisi, living one or two hundred years after that extraordinary man, may recount shoals of miracles created by tradition without ceasing, for all that, to be the most candid and most innocent man in the world. But if this biographer were to say, "I was his

companion; he preferred me to any other; everything I am about to tell you is true, for I have seen it," there is no denying that he should be called by quite another name.

This falsehood, moreover, is not the only one which the author must have committed. We have three epistles which alike bear the name of John. If there is one thing probable in the domain of criticism, it is that the first at least of these epistles is by the same author as the Fourth Gospel. One might almost call it a chapter taken out of that. The diction of the two writings is identical; while the language of the works of the New Testament is so scant in its vocabulary, and so little varied, that such inductions can be drawn with almost absolute certainty. The author of this epistle, like the author of the Gospel, gives himself out as an eye-witness (1 John i. 1–5; iv. 14) of the gospel history. He represents himself as a person well-known, enjoying high consideration in the Church. At first glance, it seems that the most natural hypothesis is to admit that all these writings are indeed the work of John, the son of Zebedee.

Let us hasten to add, nevertheless, that critics of the highest rank have not without grave reason rejected the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel. The work is too rarely cited in the oldest Christian literature; its authority only begins to appear very late.[1] Nothing is less like what might be expected from John, an old fisher on the Lake of Gennesareth, than this Gospel. The Greek in which it is written is not in any sense the Palestinian Greek which we are familiar with in the other books of the New Testament. The ideas, in particular, are of an entirely different order. Here we are deep in Philonic and almost Gnostic metaphysics. The discourses of Jesus, as reported by this pretended witness, this confidential friend, are false, often flat, nay, impossible. Finally, the Apocalypse is also given out as the work of one John, who does not, it is true, call himself an Apostle, but who in the churches of Asia arrogates to himself such a primacy that one can hardly fail to identify him with the Apostle

[1] See Introduction to this volume, pp. 50-52.

John.[1] Now, when we compare the style and thoughts of the author of the Apocalypse with the style and thoughts of the author of the Fourth Gospel and the first Johannine epistle, we find the most striking discordance. How are we to get out of that labyrinth of strange contradictions and inextricable difficulties?

For my part I see but one way. It is to hold that the Fourth Gospel is, indeed, in a sense "according to John;" that it was not written by John himself; that it was for a long time esoteric and secret in one of the schools which adhered to John. To penetrate the mystery of this school, to learn how the writing in question came forth from it, is simply impossible. Did notes or data left by the Apostle serve as a basis for the text which we read?[2] Did a secretary, nurtured by the reading of Philo, and possessing a style of his own, give to the narratives and letters of his master a turn which without this they would never have had? Have we not here something like the letters of Saint Catherine of Sienna, revised by her secretary; or like those revelations of Catherine Emmerich, of which we can say equally that they are by Catherine, and that they are by Brentano, — the ideas of Catherine having passed through the style of Brentano? May not some purely semi-Gnostics, at the end of the Apostle's life, have seized his pen, and under the pretext of aiding him in writing his recollections, and assisting him in his correspondence, incorporated their ideas and favourite expressions, covering themselves with

[1] [Renan's argument from the assumed date and authorship of the "Book of Revelation," here and elsewhere (see especially *ante*, pp. 425, 426; also 57, 262, 290), is made irrelevant by the opinion of Voelter as modified by Eberhard Vischer and coming to be widely held, that this book is fundamentally (in the words of Harnack) "a purely Jewish document, clearly traceable in its outlines and the mass of its details, supplemented and revised by a Christian, who has nothing to do with *Israel after the flesh*, but thinks only of the Gentile world, out of which the Lamb has purchased with his blood a countless multitude," — its dates ranging, according to this view, approximately from A. D. 65 to A. D. 135. — See James Martineau's "Seat of Authority in Religion," pp. 224–226.]

[2] John xix. 35; xxi. 24.

his authority?[1] Who is that "John the Elder," a sort of double of the Apostle, whose tomb used to be pointed out by the side of John's?[2] Is he a different person from the Apostle? Is he the Apostle himself, whose long life was for many years the foundation of the believer's hope?[3] I have elsewhere touched upon these questions.[4] I shall often return to them again. I have had but one aim in this, — to show that in recurring so often in the "Life of Jesus" to the Fourth Gospel, to fix the thread of my narrative, I have had strong reasons, even if this Gospel was not from the hand of the Apostle John.

[1] On this supposition we may explain the silence of Papias, which is so grave an argument against the strict authenticity of the Fourth Gospel. We might even suppose that it is to this Gospel that Papias makes unfriendly allusion in these words: "For I did not rejoice, like the multitude, in those who speak many words, . . . nor in those who call to mind the commandments of others." This would well correspond with the long discourses, wholly foreign from Jesus, which fill the Gospel ascribed to John.

[2] Eusebius, *H. E.* iii. 39.

[3] John xxi. 22, 23.

[4] See Introduction to this volume, *passim*.

INDEX.

Aceldama (Hakeldama), 405.
Advent, second, 283–285, 292.
Ænon, the name, 435.
Æons, 261.
Alogi, 59.
Annas (Hanan), 348, 349, 350, 371, 404.
Antipas (Herod), 118, 157, 183, 222, 317, 326, 350, 382, 404.
Apocalyptic ideas, 117, 281–285, 291; writings, 287; of N. T. 290.
Apocryphal writings, 19, 264; of O. T. 41; gospels, 51, 66.
Apollonius of Tyana, 44, 268, 415.
Apostles, calling of, 190; the Twelve, 294; their commission, 296–298.
Archelaus, 119.
Ascetic doctrine of Jesus, 307–310; its dangers, 312.
Asmodeus, 272.

Babism, 31, 468.
Banou, the ascetic, 226.
Baptism, 149, 150, 243; as a sign, 151 (*see* John the Baptist).
Baruch, 42, 114.
Beatitudes, 199.
Bethany, 331, 345, 347.
Bethlehem, 91.
Bethphage (procession of palms), 356, 360.
Blasphemy, process of, 370.
Boëthusim, 237, 336, 349.
Bread, breaking of, 301.
Buddha, 14, 110, 132, 211, 420.

Cæsarea Philippi, 184.
Caiaphas, 348, 350, 360, 372, 403.
Calvary, 388, 407.
Cana, 129, 130, 420, 438.
Capernaum, 174, 180, 318, 441.
Cephas (the name), 187.
Children as disciples, 217.
Chorazin and Bethsaida, 318.
Church, germs of, 298.
City of God, 288.
Clementine Homilies, 51, 58.
Communism, elements of, 203.
Corpus Christi, 27.
Crucifixion, 388–390, 394; date of, 403.
Crurifragium, 397.
Cyrenius (Quirinius), 91, 121, 255.

Daniel, Book of, 41, 42, 87, 104, 112, 263.
David, Son of, 253–255.
Demoniacal possession, 272.
Disciples of Jesus, 186–197, 409.
Dives and Lazarus, 205 (*see* Lazarus).

Ebionism, 209–213.
Ecclesiastes, 112.
Elijah, 147, 223, 289.
Enoch, Book of, 19, 20, 41, 42, 87, 112, 210, 264.
Essenes, 102, 204, 304.
Eucharist, 301–306, 366.
Exorcism, 272.

Fetishism, 78.
Fish, as symbol, 303.
Fourth Gospel, opinions on, 17, 52–59, 62; its historical value, 423–478.
Francis of Assisi (Saint), 44, 68, 269, 416.

Galilee, its population, 93; fanaticism, 122; scenery and climate, 124, 198, 216; village life, 94, 125, 215, 216.
Galilee, Sea of, 174, 179, 198–201.

Gall and vinegar, 467.
Gamaliel, 240.
Gentiles, 245–247.
Gethsemane, 331, 358.
Golden Rule, 137.
Golgotha, 387, 388.
Greeks, 247.

Herod, 105, 232, 237.
Herodians, 337.
Herodias, 157, 158, 221, 404.
Hillel, 103, 137, 142, 240, 323.
Hospitality, Oriental, 216.
Hypostases, 88, 256, 260, 299.

Isaiah, 82, 104, 113.
Islam, blasting effects of, 183.
Israel, true calling of, 84–87.

Jerusalem, 82, 376; visited by Jesus, 228, 328; the city, 229; scenery, 231; buildings, 330.
Jesus, 21, 28; the name, 92; family, 94–96, 108, 190; schooling, 99–103; knowledge of Nature, 106, 271; conception of God, 131–133; early teachings, 137–141; of worship, 141; miracles, 144, 267, 270, 273; relations with John the Baptist, 153; temptation, 165; utopian dreams, 167; idealism, 170, 258, 410; preaching at the lakeside, 198–201; in Galilee, 216; in Jerusalem, 228, 328; in the Temple, 234; conceived as Messiah, 252–257; as Son of David, 253; as Son of God, 259, 341; Son of Man, 216, 263; later enthusiasm, 313; invectives, 318, 320, 338; disputes with Pharisees, 325, 335; lament over Jerusalem, 356; trial, 370–381; death and burial, 395, 399–401. (*See* titles of the several chapters.)
Jewish authorities, 75; beliefs, 113–117; seditions, 119.
Joan of Arc, 29, 33.
John the Apostle, 52, 57, 74, 285; his calling, 192, 430.
John the Baptist, 146, 154, 426, 475; his imprisonment, 158, 220; death, 222; memory, 224; rumoured resurrection, 318.
Joseph of Arimathea, 399.
Josephus, the historian, 40, 70.
Judas of Gamala, 121.
Judas the Gaulonite, 120, 134, 164, 196.
Judas of Kerioth (Iscariot), 190, 205, 355, 361, 369, 405, 442, 459.
Justin the Apologist, 49, 50, 58, 59.

King of the Jews, the title, 378, 380, 391.
Kingdom of God (or of Heaven), 135, 160, 164, 279–288, 292; signs of its coming, 284.
Koran, 14, 74, 246.

Last Supper, 363–368.
Lazarus, 21, 205, 346, 446–454.
Levi (Matthew ?), 195, 196.
Logia of Matthew, 46, 47, 62, 64, 132, 211, 445.
Logos, doctrine of, 424–426.
Luke, gospel of, 45; its historical value, 63–66; relation to Fourth Gospel, 62, 228, 382, 445, 449, 466.

Machærus (Machero), 157, 158.
Magdala, 180.
Mahomet, 15, 28, 69, 74, 110, 276, 423.
Man of Sorrows, 82.
Maran-atha, 283.
Marcion, gospel of, 469.
Mark, gospel of, 55–57, 62, 63, 275, 404.
Martha and Mary, 207, 332, 345, 355, 449.
Mary, mother of Jesus, 93, 95, 129, 392.
Mary, mother of Mark, 239.
Mary of Magdala, 180, 189, 392, 401, 402, 470.
Matthew the publican, 195; gospel of, 62, 63, 66, 74.
Memoirs of the Apostles, 49, 50.
Messianic doctrine and expectations, 68, 87, 89, 252, 256, 280.
Metathronos, 260, 300.
Miracles, 12, 13, 26, 31, 71, 267–277, 428; workers of, 120; at Jerusalem, 345.

Nazareth, 91, 96–98, 117, 175, 231.
Nicodemus, 239, 329, 400, 434; gospel of, 433.
Nicolas of Damascus, 101.

Origins of Christianity, 16, 21, 27, 30, 37, 73.

Pagans, 245, 277.
Palestine, 72.
Papias, 46, 48, 50, 56, 74, 290, 443.
Paraclete, 19, 300.
Paradise, 111, 218, 282.
Passover, the last, 354.
Paul the Apostle, 24, 240, 414, 426, 459.
Paulus, 26.
Persecution, 384.
Persian doctrine, 111, 114, 117.
Peter, 187, 192, 365, 368, 372, 462.
Pharisees, 239, 321, 324–326, 336; their hostility, 321, 325; nicknames, 322.
Philip the Apostle, 440.
Philo, 40, 102, 450.
Pilate, 375–383.
Pilgrimages of Jews, 127.
Pirké Aboth, 75, 137, 200, 295.
Pistis Sophia, 433, 469.
Plato, 61.
Poor, kingdom of, 208, 212.
Poverty, how esteemed, 211.
Prophets, 81, 82, 267.
Proselytism, Jewish, 86.
Psylli, 297.

Quirinius (*see* Cyrenius).

Race-religions, 79, 80.
Regeneration, 281.
Resurrection, doctrine of, 285–288.
Revolutionary epochs, 109, 168.

Sabbath, 244.
Sadducees, 116, 336.
Salome (mother of James and John), 353; (daughter of Herodias), 221.
Samaria, 248–250; the woman of, 197, 250.
Sanhedrim, 372–374.
Schools, Jewish, 99.
Scribes (*soferim*), 99, 336.
Sea of Galilee, 174, 186, 195; its shore, 179; present condition, 181 (*see* Tiberias, Lake of).
Semitic religion, 80.
Shechem, 249, 250.
Sibylline writings, 42, 89, 112.
Simon of Cyrene, 389.
Simon the Leper, 21, 355, 449.
Simon Magus, 268.
Solomon's Porch, 343.
Son of David, 174, 253, 255; of Man, 173, 174, 216, 230, 263; of God, 258.
Stigmata, 452; stigmatists, 265.
Supernatural, question of the, 15.
Supper, the last, 363–368.
Symbols, 78, 151, 303, 304.
Synagogue, 176, 177.
Synoptics, 19, 60, 63–66; their historical value, 67–70, 423, 427, 429, 431–434.

Talmud, 43, 70, 75, 103, 143, 370.
Temple of Jerusalem, 230, 232–236, 241, 330, 341.
Theocracy, 312.
Therapeutæ, 102, 203, 304.
Tiberias, 183, 317; Lake of, 179, 186, 303 (*see* Sea of Galilee).
Torah, 80, 84.
Tribute money, 166, 337.
Tyre, 184, 208.

Valley of Weeping, 128.
Villages of Galilee, 106.
Virgil, 89.

Wealth, 205, 206.
Women, companions of Jesus, 188, 214; at the cross, 392; at the sepulchre, 400–402; Oriental women, 457.
Word (the *Logos*), doctrine of, 262, 425.

Zacchæus, 344, 345.
Zealots, 120.
Zebedee, sons of, 188, 191, 194, 353.

BRENTANO'S
Booksellers & Stationers